



3 1761 05318328 1

new book

THE
WORKS

OF

JOHN JEWEL, D. D.

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

EDITED BY

RICHARD WILLIAM JELF, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
AND PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE LONDON;
FORMERLY FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOL. IV.

OXFORD,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCXLVIII.

APOLOGIA

ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ.

ROM. i.

Non enim me pudet Evangelii Christi. Potentia siquidem est
Dei ad salutem omni credenti.

LONDINI:
ANNO DOMINI
M.D.LXII.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

D. JOANNI JUELLO

EPISCOPO SARISBURIENSI

P. MARTYR S. D.

OPERA Episcopi Londinensis, amplissime Præsul et P. Martyr.
Epist. Theol.
p. 804. Ed.
Gen. 1623. Domine quotidie mihi etiam atque etiam observande, allatum est exemplum tuæ Apologiæ pro Anglicana Ecclesia, quæ neque a me, neque a nostris antea fuerat visa. In tuis quidem postremis, illam prodituram potius innuisti quam significaveris: sed tantum itineris hactenus conficere non potuit, ut prius ad nos quam circiter Cal. Sextiles pervenerit. Hinc tu animo tuo metiaris, quantum damnum ob locorum distantiam subinde faciamus. Ea vero non tantum mihi, cui omnia tua probantur et mirifice placent, omnibus modis et numeris satisfecit; verumetiam Bullingero, ejusque filiis et generis; nec non Gualthero et Wolfio tam sapiens, mirabilis, et eloquens visa est, ut ejus laudandæ nullum modum faciant: nec arbitrantur hoc tempore quicquam perfectius editum fuisse. Hanc ingenio tuo felicitatem, hanc ædificationem Ecclesiæ, hoc Angliæ decus vehementer gratulor, teque obtestor, ut quam ingressus es viam pergas tuis vestigiis premere. Etenim bonam licet habeamus causam, tamen præ hostium numero pauci sunt, qui eam tueantur: et illi jam ita videntur experrecti, ut bonitate styli, et argutis sophismatis multum se probent imperitiæ multitudini. Loquor autem de Staphylis, Hosiis, et plerisque aliis hujus farinæ scriptoribus, qui hoc tempore mendaciorum Papæ strenuos patronos agunt. Quare cum in Apologia tua illa doctissima et elegantissima tantum spei de te concitaveris, certo scias, omnes bonos et doctos jam sibi polliceri, Veritatem Evangelicam te vivo non esse ab hostibus impune lacesendam. Ego vero plurimum lætor, quod illum diem viderim, quo factus sis parens tam illustris et elegantis filii. Largiatur Deus cœlestis Pater, pro sua bonitate, ut sobole non absimili frequenter augearis.

“ Apologia [Juelli] sic confecta est, ut Prima Pars sit veræ doctrinæ illustratio, et paraphrastica quædam duodecim Fidei Christianæ Articulorum expositio : Secunda, succincta et solida objectionum reprehensio. Si spectetur ordo, nihil distributius : si perspicuitas, nihil lucidius : si stylus, nihil tersius : si verba, nihil splendidius : si res, nihil nervosius : quam ego ——— optarem ——— in OMNIBUS SCHOLIS CHRISTIANÆ JUVENTUTI AD EDISCENDUM PROPONI : ex qua, et eloquentiæ præceptiones, et pietatis initia tuto et plene hauriantur.”—*Laurentius Humfredus* De Vita Juelli, p. 187.

APOLOGIA

[PART. I.]
[Vol. iv. p.
140.]

ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ.

VETUS illa est querela a primis usque Patriarcharum et Prophetarum ducta temporibus, et omnis memoriæ literis et testimoniis confirmata¹, Veritatem in terris peregrinam agere, et inter ignotos facile inimicos et calumniatores invenire. Id etsi aliis incredibile fortasse videri possit, si quæ sunt [*al. sint*] qui ista minus attente observaverint, præsertim cum hominum universum genus ipso naturæ ductu, sine magistro, sua sponte sit appetens veritatis; et Christus ipse Servator noster, cum inter homines versaretur, quasi nomine ad exprimendam omnem vim divinam, aptissime voluerit appellari Veritas: nos tamen qui in Sacris Scripturis versati sumus, quique legimus et vidimus, quid omnibus piis omnium fere temporum, quid Prophetis, quid Apostolis, quid sanctis Martyribus, quid Christo ipsi acciderit, quibus illi probris, maledictis, contumeliis, cum viverent, veritatis unius causa vexati fuerint, videmus, id non tantum non esse novum aut incredibile, sed etiam receptum jam et omnibus temporibus usitatum. Imo illud multo potius mirum atque incredibile videri posset, si pater mendaciorum² et hostis omnis veritatis Diabolus, nunc tandem repente mutaret ingenium, et speraret veritatem aliter quam mentiendo posse opprimi, aut aliis nunc artibus, quam quibus ab initio semper usus est, inciperet regnum suum stabilire. Ex omni enim memoria vix ullum tempus invenire

¹ Tertull. in Apologetico.

² Joh. viii. 44.

[PART. I.]

possumus, vel crescentis, vel constitutæ, vel nascentis religionis, quo non veritas atque innocentia indignis modis ab hominibus, et contumeliosissime acciperetur. Videt scilicet Diabolus, veritate incolumi, se incolumem esse et sua tueri non posse.

Nam, ut ne quid de veteribus Patriarchis et Prophetis commemoremus, quorum, uti diximus, nulla pars ætatis fuit a contumeliis et probris libera; scimus fuisse olim quosdam, qui dicerent³, et publice prædicarent, veteres Judæos, quos non dubitamus fuisse cultores unius et veri Dei, numinis loco aut suum, aut asinum coluisse, et omnem illam religionem nihil aliud fuisse, quam sacrilegium, et contemptum omnium numinum. Scimus Filium Dei et Salvatorem nostrum Jesum Christum, cum doceret veritatem, habitum fuisse pro præstigiatore, pro malefico, pro Samaritano, pro Beelzebub, pro seductore populi⁴, pro homine bibulo et vorace. Et quis nescit, quæ dicta olim fuerint in acerrimum præconem, atque assertorem veritatis, Divum Paulum: illum modo hominem seditiosum esse, militem conscribere, secessionem facere: modo esse Hæreticum, modo insanire, modo contentionis atque animi causa in legem Dei blasphemum esse, et Patrum instituta contemnere? Quis nescit Divum Stephanum⁵ statim, cum penitus intimis animi sensibus veritatem accepisset, et eam cœpisset libere, sicut debuit, et fortiter prædicare et præ se ferre, statim vocatum esse in iudicium capitis, quasi qui contumelias nefarie dixisset in Legem, in Moysen, in Templum, in Deum? Aut quis nescit fuisse olim, qui Sacras Scripturas arguerent vanitatis, quod in illis dicerent contraria⁶, et plane pugnantia contineri: et Apostolos Christi singulos inter se, Paulum vero ab omnibus dissensisse? Et ne longum sit omnia colligere (id enim esset infinitum) quis nescit, quæ olim convitia jacta fuerint in Patres nostros, qui primi cœperunt agnoscere et profiteri nomen Christi; illos inter se conspirare⁷, et occulta consilia inire contra

³ Cornel. Tacitus. Tertull. in Apologet. cap. 16. C. Plinius.

⁴ Joh. viii. 48. Matt. xi. 19.

⁵ Act. vi. Epiphanius.

⁶ Marcion ex Tertulliano. Ælius e Lactant.

⁷ Eusebius, lib. 5. cap. 1. Tertull. Apologet. cap. 1—3, et 7—9.

republicam, et ea causa antelucanis horis inter se in tenebris convenire, occidere pueros infantes, explere se humanis carnibus, et ferali ritu bibere humanum sanguinem; postremo extinctis luminibus, adulterium inter se, et incestum promiscue perpetrare, et fratres cum sororibus, filios cum matribus, sine reverentia sanguinis, sine pudore, sine discrimine concumbere homines impios, sine religione ulla, sine Deo: hostes humani generis, indignos luce, indignos vita?

Ista tum omnia dicebantur in populum Dei, in Christum Jesum, in Paulum, in Stephanum, in eos omnes, quicumque primis temporibus amplexi sunt veritatem Evangelii, et se passi sunt, odioso⁸ tum in vulgus nomine, appellari Christianos. Et quamvis ea non essent vera, id tamen Diabolus satis putabat sibi fore, si effecisset saltem, ut crederentur esse vera, utque Christiani publico omnium odio laborarent, et ab omnibus ad exitium quærerentur. Itaque Reges et Principes, hujusmodi tum persuasionibus inducti, occidere Prophetas Dei ad unum omnes: Esaïam ad serram, Hieremiam ad lapides, Danielelem ad leones, Amos ad vectem, Paulum ad gladium, Christum ad crucem, Christianos omnes⁹ ad carceres, ad equuleos, ad furcas, ad rupes, ad præcipitia, ad bestias, ad ignes condemnare: et rogos ingentes ex illorum vivis corporibus, tantum ad usum nocturni luminis, et ad ludibrium inflammare; eosque non alio loco numerare, quam quo sordes vilissimas, et catharmata ac ludibria totius mundi. Sic videlicet semper accepti sunt authores et professores veritatis.

Quo nos animo æquiore ferre debemus, quicumque professionem Evangelii Jesu Christi suscepimus, si in eadem causa ad eundem tractamur modum; utque olim Patres nostri, ita nos quoque hodie, nullo nostro merito, tantum quia docemus et profiteamur veritatem¹⁰, convitiis, contumeliis, mendaciis exagitamur.

Clamant hodie passim nos omnes esse Hæreticos, discessisse a fide, et novis persuasionibus atque impiis dogmatis Ecclesiæ consensum dissipavisse: nos veteres et jam olim

⁸ Tertull. in Apolog. cap. 3. ⁹ Sueton. Tranquil. in Nerone.
¹⁰ 1 Tim. iv.

[Cap. 2. div. 1. iv. p. 158.]

[Cap. 2. div. 2. iv. p. 162.]

[Cap. 2. div. 3. iv. p. 167.]

[PART. I.]

damnatas hæreses ab inferis redivivas restituere, et novas sectas, atque inauditos furores disseminare: jam etiam in contrarias factiones et sententias distractos esse, nec ullo

[Cap. 2. div. 4.
iv. p. 171.]

pacto potuisse unquam inter nos ipsos convenire: esse homines impios, et, gigantum more, Deo ipsi bellum facere, et

[Cap. 2. div. 6.
iv. p. 172.]

prorsus sine omni Numinis cura, cultuque vivere: nos omnia recte facta despicere, non virtutis disciplina uti ulla, non legibus, non moribus: non fas, non jus, non æquum, non rectum colere: ad omnia flagitia laxare fræna, et populum ad omne genus licentiæ atque libidinis provocare:

[Cap. 2. div. 7.
iv. p. 174.]

nos id agere et quærere, ut monarchiæ et regnorum status evertantur, et omnia ad popularem temeritatem et imperitiæ

[Cap. 2. div. 8.
iv. p. 180.]

multitudinis dominationem redigantur: nos ab Ecclesia Catholica tumultuose defecisse, et nefario schismate orbem terrarum concussisse, et pacem communem atque otium Ecclesiæ publicum conturbasse: utque olim Dathan et Abiron¹¹ ab Aarone et Mose, ita nos hodie a Romano Pontifice sine ulla satis justa causa secessionem fecisse:

[Cap. II. div. 9.
iv. p. 183.]

priscorum Patrum et veterum Conciliorum auctoritatem pro nihilo putare: ceremonias antiquas a patribus et proavis nostris multis jam seculis, bonis moribus et melioribus temporibus approbatas, temere et insolenter abrogasse: et nostra tantum privata auctoritate, injussu sacri et Œcumenici Concilii, novos in Ecclesiam ritus invexisse: atque ista nos omnia, non religionis causa, sed contentionis tantum studio fecisse: se autem nihil prorsus immutasse; omnia vero ut ab apostolis tradita, et ab antiquissimis Patribus approbata fuerint, ad hunc usque diem tot per sæcula retinuisse.

[Cap. 2. div.
10. iv. p. 189.]

Neve res calumniis tantum agi, et ad invidiam nostram in angulis solum jactari videretur, subornati sunt a Romanis Pontificibus homines quidam satis disertis, et non indoctis, qui ad causam desperatam accederent, et eam libris et longis orationibus exornarent: ut, cum eleganter et copiose ageretur, homines imperiti possent, in ea aliquid esse, suspicari. Videbant, scilicet, ubique terrarum causam suam inclinare, artes suas jam videri, et minoris putari, et præsidia sua in singulos dies labefactari; et omnino causam magno-

¹¹ Num. xvi.

pere egere patrocinio. Eorum autem, quæ ab illis in nos dicuntur, partim manifeste falsa sunt, et ipsorum, a quibus dicuntur, judicio condemnata: partim, etsi falsa sunt illa quoque, tamen speciem veri aliquam et similitudinem præ se ferunt, ut in illis incautus lector (maxime vero, si accedat istorum composita et elegans oratio) facile circumveniri, et errare possit; partim vero sunt ejusmodi, ut ea nos non tamquam crimina refugere, sed tamquam recte atque optima ratione facta, agnoscere, et profiteri debeamus. Nam, ut uno verbo quod res est dicamus, isti omnia nostra, etiam ea, quæ ne ipsi quidem negare possunt recte atque ordine esse facta, calumniantur; et quasi nihil a nobis aut fieri aut dici recte possit, ita dicta nostra, factaque omnia malitiose depravant. Simplicius quidem et candidius agendum erat, si vere agere voluissent. Nunc autem nec vere, nec ingenue, nec Christiano more modoque, sed obscure et veteratorie, mendaciis nos oppugnant: et cæcitate populi et inscitia, atque ignorantia Principum, ad odium nostri et ad opprimendam veritatem abutuntur. Est hæc potestas tenebrarum, et hominum stupore magis imperitæ multitudinis, et tenebris, quam veritate aut luce fidentium, utque Hieronymus ait, clausis oculis veritati perspicue contradicentium.

Nos vero Deo optimo maximo gratias agimus, eam esse causam nostram, in quam isti cum cuperent, nullam contumeliam possent dicere, quæ non eadem in sanctos Patres, in Prophetas, in Apostolos, in Petrum, in Paulum, in Christum ipsum torqueri posset.

Jam vero si istis ad maledicendum disertis et eloquentibus esse licet, nos in optima nostra causa, ad vere respondendum, haud sane convenit esse mutos. Negligere enim quid de se, suaque causa, quamvis false et calumniose, dicatur, (præsertim cum id ejusmodi sit, ut in eo Dei majestas et religionis negotium violetur) hominum est dissolutorum, et ad injurias Divini nominis secure atque impie conniventium. Etsi enim aliæ injuriæ sæpe magnæ ab homine modesto et Christiano ferri ac dissimulari possint: tamen Hæreseos notam qui dissimulet, eum Ruffinus negare solebat esse Christianum. Faciemus ergo nunc id, quod omnes leges, quod vox naturæ ipsa jubet fieri, quodque Christus

[PART. I.]

[Cap. 4. div. 2.
iv. p. 197.]

ipse in simili causa contumeliis appetitus fecit, ut istorum criminationes propulsemus; ut causam innocentiamque nostram modeste et vere tueamur. Nam Christus quidem, cum a Phariseis accusaretur veneficii, quasi consuetudinem haberet cum dæmonibus, et illorum ope multa faceret; “Ego (inquit¹²) dæmonium non habeo, sed glorifico Patrem meum; vos autem affecistis me ignominia.” Et Paulus, cum a Festo proconsule contemneretur ut insanus; “Ego (inquit¹³) optime l’este, non insanio, ut tu putas, sed veritatis et sobrietatis verba loquor.” Et Christiani veteres cum pro homicidis, adulteris, incestis, rerum publicarum perturbatoribus ad populum traducerentur, et viderent huiusmodi criminationibus in dubium vocari posse Religionem quam profitebantur; maxime vero, si tacere viderentur, et quodammodo crimen agnoscere; ne ea res Evangelii cursum impediret, habuerunt orationes¹⁴, scripserunt libros supplices, apud Imperatores et Principes verba fecerunt, ut se suosque publice defenderent.

[Cap. 4. div. 3.
iv. p. 203.]

Nos vero cum proximis istis viginti annis, tot millia nostrorum fratrum inter exquisitissimos cruciatus testimonium dixerint veritati; et Principes, cum frænare cuperent Evangelium, multa moliendo nihil egerint; et totus jam prope terrarum orbis ad aspiciendam lucem oculos incipiat aperire; satis jam dictam et defensam putamus esse causam nostram: cumque res ipsa satis pro se loquatur,

[Cap. 4. div. 7.
iv. p. 212.]

non multum opus esse verbis. Nam si Pontifices ipsi vel-
lent, aut etiam si possent, rem ipsam secum, et initia progressusque Religionis nostræ cogitare, quemadmodum sua pene omnia, nullo impellente, sine ulla humana ope ceciderint; nostra vero invitis ab initio Imperatoribus, invitis tot Regibus, invitis Pontificibus, invitis prope omnibus, incrementa ceperint, et paulatim in omnes terras propagata fuerint, atque etiam postremo in Regum jam aulas et palatia pervenerint; vel hæc ipsa satis illis magna indicia esse possent, Deum ipsum pro nobis propugnare, et ipsorum conatus de cælo ridere, et eam esse vim veritatis, quam nec humanæ vires, nec inferorum portæ possunt convellere.

¹² Joh. viii. 49.¹³ Act. xxvi. 25.¹⁴ Quadratus, Justinus, Melito, Tertull. alique.

Non enim insaniunt hodie tot Civitates liberæ, tot Reges, tot Principes, qui a Sede Romana defecerunt, et se potius ad Christi Evangelium adjunxerunt.

Neque tamen si Pontificibus otium hactenus nunquam fuit de istis rebus attente et serio cogitandi, aut si nunc aliæ illos curæ impediunt, et diverse distrahunt, aut si ista studia vulgaria et levia esse putant, et nihil ad dignitatem Pontificiam pertinere, idcirco causa nostra debet videri deterior. Aut si illi quod vident, videre forte nolunt, veritatem agnitam potius oppugnant, idcirco nos habendi statim sumus pro Hæreticis, qui illorum voluntati non obsequimur? Quod si Pius Pontifex¹⁵ is esset, non dicimus, quem se tantopere dici cupit; sed si is omnino esset, qui nos vel fratres suos, vel omnino homines esse duceret, rationes prius nostras, et quid a nobis, quid contra nos dici posset, diligenter expendisset; ac non ita temere cæcis tantum præjudiciis, bonam partem orbis terrarum, tot doctos et pios viros, tot respublicas, tot Reges, tot Principes in Bulla illa sua, qua nuper simulabat Concilium, inauditos, indicta causa, condemnasset.

Verum, ne, quia ad hunc modum publice ab illo notati sumus, tacendo videamur crimen confiteri, et præsertim quia in Publico Concilio, in quo ille nemini mortalium jus esse vult ferendi suffragii, sententiæque dicendæ, nisi jurato addictoque potestati suæ, audiri nullo modo possumus (id enim proximis Comitibus Tridentinis nimium experti sumus, cum Principum Germaniæ, et liberarum Civitatum legati, et Theologi prorsus ab omni conventu excluderentur: neque adhuc oblivisci possumus, Julium Tertium ante decem annos diligenter cavisce rescripto suo, ne quis nostrorum hominum in Concilio audiretur, nisi si quis forte esset, qui vellet palinodiam canere, et mutare sententiam:) vel ea maxime causa visum est nobis rationem Fidei nostræ scripto reddere, et ad ea, quæ nobis publice objecta sunt, vere, ac publice respondere; ut orbis terrarum videre possit partes et fundamenta ejus doctrinæ, cui tot boni viri postposuerunt vitam suam; utque omnes intelligant cujusmodi tan-

[PART. I.]

dem homines illi sint, quidque de Deo et religione sentiant, quos Romanus Episcopus, antequam vocarentur ad dicendam causam, non satis considerate, nullo exemplo, nullo jure, tantum quod illos audiret a se suisque in aliqua parte Religionis discrepare, condemnavit pro Hæreticis.

[Cap. 6. div. 2.
iv. p. 240.]

Et quamvis D. Hieronymus in suspitione Hæreseos neminem velit esse patientem, nos tamen nec acerbe, aut dicaciter agemus, nec efferemur iracundia : quamquam nec acerbus, nec dicax videri debet, qui vera dicit. Istam eloquentiam libentius relinquimus adversariis nostris, qui quicquid in nos dicunt [*al.* dicant], quantumvis id acerbe aut contumeliose dictum sit, tamen satis modeste et apposite dictum putant : verene an falso, nihil curant. Nobis his artibus opus non est, qui veritatem defendimus.

Quod si docemus sacrosanctum Dei Evangelium, et veteres Episcopos, atque Ecclesiam Primitivam nobiscum facere ; nosque non sine justa causa et ab istis discessisse, et ad Apostolos, veteresque Catholicos Patres rediisse ; idque non obscure, aut vafre, sed bona fide coram Deo, vere, ingenue, dilucide, et perspicue facimus : si illi ipsi qui nostram doctrinam fugiunt, et sese catholicos dici volunt, aperte videbunt omnes illos titulos antiquitatis, de quibus tantopere gloriantur, sibi excuti de manibus, et in nostra causa plus nervorum fuisse quam putarint : speramus, neminem illorum ita negligentem fore salutis suæ, quin ut velit [*ed. pr.* velint] aliquando cogitationem suscipere, ad utros potius se adjungat. Certe quidem, nisi quis plane animo obduruerit, et audire nolit, cum non pœnitebit, animum ad defensionem nostram advertere, et quid a nobis, quamque ad Religionem Christianam convenienter, apteque dicatur, attendere.

[Cap. 7. div. 2.
iv. p. 242.]

Nam quod nos appellant Hæreticos, est illud crimen ita grave, ut nisi videatur, nisi palpetur, nisi manibus digitisque teneatur, credi facile de homine Christiano non debeat. Est enim Hæresis destitutio salutis, abjectio gratiæ Dei, discessio a Corpore et Spiritu Christi. Sed fuit hoc semper istis, et illorum patribus familiare ac solenne, ut si qui essent, qui de illorum erroribus quererentur, et religionem cuperent restitutam, eos statim quasi novatores rerum et homines factiosos, condemnarent pro Hæreticis.

[Cap. 7. div. 3.
iv. p. 245.]

Christus enim non alia causa dictus est Samaritanus, quam quod ad novam quandam Religionem, et ad Hæresim defecisse putaretur. Et Paulus Apostolus Christi vocatus est in iudicium, ut causam diceret de Hæresi. “Ego quidem (inquit¹⁶) juxta hanc viam, quam isti vocant Hæresim, colo patrium Deum, credens omnibus quæ scripta sunt in Lege, et in Prophetis.”

Breviter, universa ista Religio, quam hodie profitentur homines Christiani, primis temporibus¹⁷ ab ethnicis hominibus Secta dicta est, et Hæresis. His isti vocibus semper impleverunt aures Principum; ut cum illi opinione præjudicata nos odissent, et quicquid a nobis diceretur, haberent pro factione et Hæresi, a re ipsa, et a cognitione causæ abducerentur. Sed quanto crimen illud gravius est et atrocius, tanto argumentis majoribus, et clarioribus probari debuit; hoc præsertim tempore, postquam homines cœperunt minus istorum oraculis habere fidei, et in illorum doctrinam diligentius inquirere, quam solebant. Aliter enim nunc institutus est populus Dei, atque olim fuit, cum omnia Pontificum Romanorum dictata haberentur pro Evangelio, et omnis Religio ab illorum tantum autoritate penderet. Extant hodie Sacræ Literæ, extant scripta Apostolorum et Prophetarum, ex quibus¹⁸ et omnis Veritas, et doctrina Catholica probari possit, et omnis Hæresis refutari.

Cum nihil horum ab istis proferatur, tamen nos Hæreticos appellari, qui nec a Christo, nec ab Apostolis, nec a Prophetis defecerimus, injuriosum est et peracerbum. Hoc gladio Christus rejecit diabolum, cum ab illo tentaretur: his armis evertenda et profiganda est omnis altitudo¹⁹, quæ sese attollit adversus Deum. “Omnis scriptura (inquit Paulus²⁰) divinitus inspirata, utilis est ad docendum, ad refutandum, ad instituendum, ad arguendum, ut vir Dei perfectus sit, et ad omne opus bonum instructus.” Sic semper pii Patres contra Hæreticos non aliunde quam e Sacris Scripturis pugnauerunt. Augustinus²¹ cum dispu-

[Cap. 8. div. 1. iv. p. 250.]

[Cap. 8. div. 2. iv. p. 262.]

[Cap. 9. div. 1. iv. p. 265.]

[Cap. 9. div. 2. iv. p. 274.]

¹⁶ Act. xxiv. 14.

¹⁷ Tertull. in Apologetico.

¹⁸ 2 Tim. iii. 15.

¹⁹ 2 Cor. x. 5.

²⁰ 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

²¹ De Unitate Eccl. cap. 3. Eadem sententia habetur contra Maximinum, Arianorum Episcopum, lib. 3. cap. 14.

[PART. I.]

taret adversus Petilianum, Hæreticum Donatistam, Ne, inquit, audiantur inter nos hæc verba; Ego dico, aut Tu dicis: sic potius dicamus, Hæc dicit Dominus: ibi quæramus Ec-

[Cap. 9. div. 3. iv. p. 278.]

clesiam: ibi discutiamus causam nostram. Et Hieronymus: Omnia, inquit²², ea quæ absque testimonio scripturarum quasi tradita ab Apostolis asseruntur, percutiuntur gladio Dei.

[Cap. 9. div. 4. iv. p. 287.]

Ambrosius etiam ad Gratianum Imperatorem, Interrogentur, inquit, Scripturæ: interrogentur Apostoli, interrogentur Prophetæ, interrogetur Christus. Non dubitabant, videlicet, tum temporis, Catholici Patres et Episcopi, Religionem nostram satis e divinis Scripturis probari posse: nec unquam illi quenquam habere ausi sunt pro Hæretico, cujus errorem non possent ex iisdem illis Scripturis perspicue et liquido coarguere. Nos quidem, ut cum D. Paulo²³ respondeamus, Juxta hanc viam, quam isti appellant Hæresin, colimus Deum, et Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et recipimus omnia, quæ aut in Lege, aut in Prophetis, aut in Apostolorum libris scripta sunt.

[Cap. 10. div. 1. iv. p. 291.]

Quare si nos sumus Hæretici, si isti sunt (quod appellari volunt) Catholici, cur non faciunt id, quod vident Patres, Catholicos viros, semper fecisse? Cur nos e Sacris Scripturis non convincunt? Cur nos ad illarum examen non revocant? Cur nos non ostendunt a Christo, a Prophetis, ab Apostolis, a Sanctis Patribus discessisse? Quid hærent? Quid fugiunt? Est Dei causa. Cur eam dubitant permittere Verbo Dei? Quod si nos sumus Hæretici, qui omnes nostras controversias referimus ad Sacras literas, quique ad illas ipsas voces, quas scimus a Deo ipso consignatas esse, provocamus, et illis alia omnia, quæcunque possunt ab hominibus excogitari, postponimus: quid istos, quos tandem homines aut quales convenit appellari, qui Sacrarum Scripturarum, hoc est, Dei ipsius judicium reformidant, et sua illis somnia et frigidissima commenta anteponunt, et, traditionum suarum causa, Christi atque Apostolorum instituta

[Cap. 10. div. 2. iv. p. 307.]

aliquot jam sæcula violarunt? Aiunt Sophoclem Poetam tragicum, cum jam senex esset, et accusaretur apud iudices a filiis suis pro deliro, et fatuo, quasi qui rem suam fami-

²² In primum cap. Aggei.²³ Act. xxiv. 14.

liarem temere profunderet, et opus jam habere videretur curatore; ut se purgaret eo crimine, venisse in iudicium, et cum pronunciasset *Œdipum Coloneum*, *Tragœdiam* a se illis ipsis diebus, cum accusaretur, valde elaborate et per-eleganter scriptam, ultro interrogasse iudices, num illud carmen videretur esse hominis delirantis.

Ita nos quoque, quoniam istis furere videmur, et ab illis traducimur pro Hæreticis, quasi quibus nihil jam rei sit nec cum Christo, nec cum Ecclesia Dei, non alienum aut inutile fore existimavimus, si aperte, et libere proponamus fidem nostram in qua stamus, et omnem illam spem quam habemus in Christo Jesu: ut omnes videre possint, quid nos de quaque parte Religionis Christianæ sentiamus, et statuere secum ipsi possint, an ea Fides, quam videbunt et verbis Christi, et Apostolorum scriptis, et Catholicorum Patrum testimoniis, et multorum sæculorum exemplis confirmatam, tantum sit rabies quædam hominum furentium, et conspi-ratio Hæreticorum.

CREDIMUS ergo, unam quandam naturam esse, et vim [PART.II.]
Divinam, quam appellamus Deum; eamque in tres personas [Cap. I. div. I.
iv. p. 311.]
æquales distinctam esse, in Patrem, in Filium, in Spiritum Sanctum, ejusdem omnes potestatis, ejusdem majestatis, ejusdem æternitatis, ejusdem divinitatis, ejusdem substantiæ. Et quamvis tres illæ personæ ita distinctæ sint, ut nec Pater sit Filius, nec Filius sit Spiritus Sanctus aut Pater: Deum tamen esse unum, et illum unum creasse cælum, et terram, et omnia quæ cæli complexu continentur.

CREDIMUS Jesum Christum Filium unicum æterni Patris, quemadmodum jam olim ante omnia initia decretum fuerat, cum venisset plenitudo temporis, suscepisse carnem, et omnem naturam humanam, ex Beata illa et pura Virgine, ut indicaret hominibus arcanam, et reconditam voluntatem Patris sui, quæ abdita fuerat a sæculis et generationibus; utque in humano corpore perageret Mysterium redemptionis nostræ; et peccata nostra, et Syngrapham illam quæ erat scripta contra nos, affigeret ad crucem.

Eum credimus nostra causa esse mortuum, sepultum, descendisse ad inferos, tertia die vi divina rediisse ad vitam, et resurrexisse: post quadraginta dies, spectantibus disci-

[PART. II.]

pulis, ascendisse in cœlum, ut impleret omnia, et corpus illud ipsum, in quo natus, in quo versatus, in quo ludibrio habitus, in quo gravissimos cruciatus, et dirum genus mortis²⁴ passus fuerat, in quo resurrexerat, in quo ascenderat ad Patris dextram, supra omnem Principatum et Potestatem, et Virtutem, et Dominationem, et omne nomen quod nominatur, non solum in hoc sæculo, sed etiam in futuro, in Majestate et gloria collocasse : ibi eum nunc sedere, et sessurum esse²⁵, donec omnia perficiantur. Et quamvis Majestas et Divinitas Christi ubique diffusa sit, tamen corpus ejus, ut Augustinus ait²⁶, in uno loco esse oportere : Christum corpori suo Majestatem dedisse, naturam tamen corporis non ademisse : Neque ita²⁷ asserendum esse Christum Deum, ut eum negemus esse Hominem : Utque ait martyr Vigilius²⁸, Christum humana sua natura nos reliquisse ; Divinitate autem non reliquisse ; Eumque cum absit a nobis²⁹ per formam servi, tamen semper esse nobiscum per formam Dei.

Ab illo loco credimus Christum rediturum esse ad exercendum publicum illud Judicium, tam de illis quos inveniet adhuc in corpore superstites, quam de mortuis.

[Cap. 1. div. 2.
iv. p. 332.]

CREDIMUS Spiritum Sanctum, qui est tertia persona in sacra Triade, illum verum esse Deum ; Non factum, non creatum, non genitum, sed ab utroque, Patre, scilicet, et Filio, ratione quadam mortalibus incognita ac ineffabili, procedentem. Illius esse duritiem humani cordis emollire, quum aut per salutiferam prædicationem Evangelii, aut alia quacunque ratione in pectora hominum recipitur : Illum eos illuminare, et in agnitionem Dei, atque in omnem viam veritatis et in totius vitæ novitatem, et perpetuam salutis spem perducere.

[Cap. 2. div. 1.
iv. p. 334.]

CREDIMUS, unam esse Ecclesiam Dei, eamque, non ut olim apud Judæos, in unum aliquem angulum aut regnum conclusam ; sed Catholicam atque universalem esse, et diffusam in totum terrarum orbem, ut nulla nunc natio sit,

²⁴ Aug. Tract. 50 in Johan.²⁵ Act. iii. 21.²⁶ Aug. Tract. 50 in Johan.²⁷ Ad Dardan.²⁸ Contra Eutyech. lib. 1.²⁹ Fulgentius ad Regem Thra-symundum.

quæ possit vere conqueri, se exclusam esse, et non posse ad ecclesiam, et populum Dei pertinere. Eam ecclesiam esse regnum, esse corpus, esse sponsam Christi : ejus regni Christum solum esse Principem : ejus corporis Christum solum esse caput : ejus sponsæ Christum solum esse sponsum. Varios in ecclesia esse ordines ministrorum : alios esse diaconos, alios presbyteros, alios episcopos, quibus institutio populi et religionis cura et procuratio commissa sit ; neminem tamen unum nec esse, nec esse posse, qui summæ rerum universæ præsit : nam et Christum semper adesse ecclesiæ suæ, et vicario homine, qui ex asse in integrum succedat, non egere : et neminem mortalem posse existere, qui universam ecclesiam, hoc est, omnes partes orbis terrarum, vel animo complecti, nedum ordine collocare, et recte ac commode administrare possit : apostolos, ut Cyprianus ait³⁰, pari omnes inter se fuisse potestate ; atque hoc idem fuisse alios, quod Petrus fuit ; omnibus ex æquo dictum fuisse, Pascite ; omnibus, Ite in mundum universum ; omnibus, Docete evangelium ; et ut ait Hieronymus³¹, Omnes episcopos, ubicunque tandem sint, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopolis, sive Rhegii, ejusdem esse meriti, ejusdem sacerdotii. Utque Cyprianus ait³² ; Episcopatum unum esse, et ejus partem in solidum teneri a singulis : et de sententia Nicæni concilii, Romanum episcopum nihilo plus juris in ecclesiam Dei obtinere, quam reliquos patriarchas, Alexandrinum, et Antiochenum : Romanum vero episcopum, qui nunc ad se unum omnia revocat, nisi officium faciat, nisi administret sacramenta, nisi instituat populum, nisi moneat, nisi doceat, ne episcopum quidem, aut omnino presbyterum jure dicendum esse. Episcopum enim, ut Augustinus ait, nomen esse operis³³, non honoris : ut ille se intelligat non esse episcopum, qui velit præesse, et non prodesse. Caput vero ecclesiæ totius, aut universalem episcopum, non magis aut illum, aut alium quemvis mortalem esse posse, quam sponsum, quam lucem, quam salutem, quam vitam ecclesiæ. Hæc enim esse Christi unius privilegia, et nomina,

[Cap. 3. div. 1. iv. p. 344.]

[Cap. 3. div. 2. iv. p. 349.]

[Cap. 3. div. 3. iv. p. 369.]

[Cap. 3. div. 4. iv. p. 375.]

[Cap. 3. div. 5. iv. p. 377.]

[Cap. 3. div. 6. iv. p. 402.]

[Cap. 3. div. 1. iv. p. 408.]

[Cap. 4. div. 1. iv. p. 412.]

³⁰ De Simplicitate Prælatorum.³¹ Ad Evagrium.³² De Simplicitate Prælatorum.³³ 1 Tim. iii. 1.

[PART.II.]

et illi uni proprie atque unice convenire: neque unquam quenkum Romanum episcopum ante Phocam imperatorem (quem scimus, interfecto imperatore Mauricio domino suo, per nefarium scelus ad imperium aspirasse), hoc est, ante sexcentiesimum decimum tertium annum a Christo nato, unquam passum fuisse sese tam superbo nomine salutari: concilium etiam Carthaginense³⁴ diserte cavisse, ne quis episcopus, aut summus pontifex, aut primus sacerdos diceretur: episcopum vero Romanum, quoniam ita hodie dici vult, et alienam potestatem sibi vindicat, præterquam quod aperte facit contra vetera concilia, contraque patres, (si Gregorio³⁵ suo velit credere) nomen arrogans, profanum, sacrilegum, Antichristianum, sibi imponere; esse regem superbiæ, esse Luciferum, qui se fratribus suis anteponat; abjecisse fidem; esse præcursores Antichristi.

[Cap. 4. div. 2. iv. p. 416.]

Ministrum legitime vocari oportere, et recte atque ordine præfici ecclesiæ Dei: neminem autem ad sacrum ministerium pro suo arbitrio, et libidine posse se intrudere. Quo major nobis ab istis fit injuria, quibus nihil sæpius in ore est, quam apud nos nihil ordine, nihil decenter, omnia confuse ac perturbate fieri; omnes apud nos esse sacerdotes, omnes esse doctores, omnes esse interpretes.

[Cap. 6. div. 1. iv. p. 486.]

[Cap. 6. div. 2. iv. p. 491.]

Ministris a Christo datam esse dicimus ligandi, solvendi, aperiendi, claudendi, potestatem. Ac solvendi quidem munus in eo situm esse, ut minister, vel dejectis animis et vere resipientibus, per evangelii prædicationem, merita Christi, absolutionemque offerat, et certam peccatorum condonationem, ac spem salutis æternæ denunciet: aut ut eos qui gravi scandalo, et notabili publicoque aliquo delicto fratrum animos offenderint, et sese a communi societate ecclesiæ, et a Christi corpore quodammodo abalienarint, resipiscentes reconciliet, et in fidelium cœtum atque unitatem recolligat ac restituat. Ligandi vero illum claudendique potestatem exercere dicimus, quoties vel incredulis et contumacibus regni cœlorum januam occludit, illisque vindictam Dei, et sempiternum supplicium edicit, vel publice excommunicatos ab ecclesiæ gremio excludit. Sententiam autem, quam-

[Cap. 6. div. 3. iv. p. 503.]

³⁴ Cap. 47.³⁵ Gregor. lib. iv. Epist. 76, 78, 80. et lib. vii. Ep. 69.

cunque ministri Dei ad hunc modum tulerint, Deus ipse ita comprobatur, ut quicquid hic illorum opera solvitur et ligatur in terris, idem ipse solvere et ligare velit, et ratum habere in cœlis. Claves autem quibus aut claudere regnum cœlorum, aut aperire possint, ut Chrysostomus ait, dicimus esse scientiam scripturarum: ut Tertullianus, esse interpretationem legis: ut Eusebius, esse verbum Dei. Accipisse autem discipulos Christi hanc potestatem, non ut audirent arcanas populi confessiones, aut captarent murmura, quod sacrificuli nunc omnes passim faciunt, atque ita faciunt, quasi in eo solo sita sit omnis vis atque usus clavium; sed ut irent, ut docerent, ut publicarent evangelium, ut essent credentibus odor vitæ ad vitam; ut essent incredulis atque infidelibus odor mortis ad mortem; ut piorum animi conscientia superioris vitæ et errorum consternati, postquam adspicere cœpissent lucem evangelii, et in Christum credere, ut fores clave, ita illi verbo Dei aperirentur: impii autem et contumaces, quique nollent credere et redire in viam, quasi obserati et clausi relinquerentur, et proficerent, ut Paulus ait³⁶, in deterius. Hanc esse rationem clavium; hoc pacto aut aperiri aut claudi hominum conscientias; sacerdotem quidem esse judicem, nullius tamen eum potestatis, ut ait Ambrosius³⁷, jus obtinere: idcirco Christum his verbis increpasse scribas et Phariseos, ut coargueret illorum in docendo negligentiam: Væ (inquit³⁸) vobis scribæ et Pharisei, qui abstulistis claves scientiæ, et clausistis regnum cœlorum coram hominibus. Cumque clavis, qua aditus nobis aperitur ad regnum Dei, sit verbum evangelii, et interpretatio legis et scripturarum, ubi non sit verbum, ibi dicimus non esse clavem: et cum unum omnibus datum sit verbum, unaque sit omnium clavis, unam esse ministrorum omnium, quod quidem ad aperiendum, aut claudendum attinet, potestatem: imo etiam pontificem ipsum, quamvis illi suaviter cantillentur illa verba a parasitis suis, Tibi dabo³⁹ claves regni cœlorum, ac si eæ illi uni, et præterea mortalium nemini

[Cap. 7. div. 1. iv. p. 507.]

[Cap. 7. div. 2. iv. p. 510.]

[Cap. 7. div. 3. iv. p. 531.]

[Cap. 7. div. 4. iv. p. 535.]

[Cap. 7. div. 5. iv. p. 537.]

³⁶ 2 Tim. iii. 13.³⁸ Luc. xi. 52. Mat. xxiii. 13.³⁷ De Pœnitent. dist. 1. c. Verbum Dei.³⁹ Mat. xvi. 19.

[PART.II.]

convenirent; nisi id agat, ut hominum flectantur conscientiae, et succumbant verbo Dei, negamus aut aperire, aut claudere, aut omnino habere claves. Et quamvis doceat, et instituat populum (quod utinam aliquando et vere faciat, et inducat aliquando animum, esse eam aliquam saltem partem officii sui) tamen ejus clavem nihilo aut meliorem aut majorem esse, quam aliorum. Quis enim illum discrevit? Quis illum docuit doctius aperire, aut melius absolvere, quam fratres suos?

[Cap. 8, div. 1.
iv. p. 543.]

Matrimonium in omni genere et statu hominum, in patriarchis, in prophetis, in apostolis, in sanctis martyribus, in ministris ecclesiarum, in episcopis, sanctum et honorificum esse dicimus; et, ut Chrysostomus ait⁴⁰, fas et jus esse cum

[Cap. 8, div. 6.
iv. p. 589.]

eo ad cathedram episcopalem ascendere; utque Sozomenus ait de Spiridione, et Nazianzenus de patre suo, episcopum pium et industrium nihilo deterius ea causa, imo melius

[Cap. 8, div. 3.
iv. p. 599.]

etiam, et utilius versari in ministerio. Legem autem illam quae hominibus eam libertatem per vim adimat, et invitos adigat ad cœlibatum, esse, ut divus Paulus ait⁴¹, doctrinam dæmoniorum; et ex eo (quod episcopus Augustanus, Faber, abbas Panormitanus, Latomus, Opus illud Tripartitum quod adjunctum est secundo tomo conciliorum, aliique pontificiarum partium satellites, resque adeo ipsa, et omnes historiae confitentur) incredibilem vitæ ac morum impuritatem in ministris Dei, et horrenda flagitia esse consecuta: et recte dixisse Pium secundum⁴² Romanum episcopum, videre se multas causas, cur eripiendæ fuerint uxores sacerdotibus, multo autem et plures videre, et graviore, cur sint reddendæ.

[Cap. 9, div. 1.
iv. p. 619.]

Recipimus et amplectimur omnes canonicas scripturas, et Veteris et Novi Testamenti: Deoque nostro gratias agimus, qui eam lucem nobis excitavit, quam semper haberemus in oculis, ne vel humana fraude, vel insidiis dæmonum, ad errores et fabulas abduceremur: eas esse cœlestes voces, per quas Deus voluntatem suam nobis patefecerit: in illis solis posse hominum animos acquiescere: in illis ea omnia

⁴⁰ In 'Titum primo, hom. 2; nodia sua super Basilium. Theoph. ad 'Titum primo; Eus. lib. xviii. cap. 5. [Nazianz.] in mo-

⁴¹ 1 Tim. iv. 1, 3.

⁴² Platina in Pii II. vita.

quæcunque ad nostram salutem sint necessaria, ut Origenes, Augustinus, Chrysostomus, Cyrillus docuerunt, cumulate et plene contineri: eas esse vim et potentiam⁴³ Dei ad salutem: eas esse fundamenta prophetarum et apostolorum, in quibus ædificata sit ecclesia Dei: eas esse certissimam normam, ad quam ea, si vacillet aut erret, possit exigi, et ad quam omnis doctrina ecclesiastica debeat revocari: contra eas nec legem, nec traditionem, nec consuetudinem ullam audiendam esse⁴⁴: ne, si Paulus quidem ipse, aut angelus de cœlo veniat, et secus doceat.

Recipimus sacramenta ecclesiæ, hoc est, sacra quædam signa et cæremonias, quibus Christus nos uti voluit, ut illis mysteria salutis nostræ nobis ante oculos constitueret, et fidem nostram, quam habemus in ejus sanguine, vehementius confirmaret, et gratiam suam in cordibus nostris obsignaret. Eaque cum Tertulliano, Origene, Ambrosio, Augustino, Hieronymo, Chrysostomo, Basilio, Dionysio, aliisque catholicis patribus, figuras, signa, symbola, typos, antitypa, formas, sigilla, signacula, similitudines, exemplaria, imagines, recordationes, memorias appellamus. Nec dubitamus etiam cum eisdem dicere, esse illa visibilia quædam verba, signacula justitiæ, symbola gratiæ: diserteque pronunciamus in cœna credentibus vere exhiberi corpus et sanguinem Domini, carnem Filii Dei, vivificantem animas nostras, cibum superne venientem, immortalitatis alimoniam, gratiam, veritatem, vitam: eamque communionem esse corporis et sanguinis Christi, cujus participatione vivificamur, vegetamur, et pascimur ad immortalitatem, et per quam jungimur, unimur, et incorporamur Christo, ut nos in illo maneamus, et ille in nobis.

Duo autem sacramenta, quæ eo nomine proprie censenda sint, agnoscimus; baptismum, et eucharistiam. Tot enim videmus tradita esse et consecrata a Christo, et a veteribus patribus, Ambrosio, et Augustino, approbata.

Et baptismum quidem sacramentum esse remissionis peccatorum, et ejus ablutionis quam habemus in Christi sanguine; et ab eo neminem, qui velit profiteri nomen

⁴³ Rom. i. 16.⁴⁴ Gal. i. 8.

[PART. II.]

Christi, ne infantes quidem Christianorum hominum, quoniam nascuntur in peccato, et pertinent ad populum Dei, arcendos esse.

[Cap. 12, div.
1. v. p. 38.]

Eucharistiam esse sacramentum, hoc est, symbolum conspicuum corporis et sanguinis Christi, in quo subjicitur quodammodo oculis nostris mors Christi, et ejus resurrectio, et quæcunque gessit in humano corpore: ut de ejus morte et nostra liberatione gratias agamus, et frequentatione sacramentorum, ejus rei memoriam assidue renovemus; ut vero Christi corpore et sanguine alamur, in spem resurrectionis et vitæ æternæ, utque pro certissimo habeamus, id esse animis nostris alendis corpus et sanguinem Christi,

[Cap. 12, div.
2. v. p. 50.]

quod alendis corporibus est panis et vinum. Ad hoc epulum invitandum esse populum, ut omnes inter se communicent, et societatem suam inter se, spemque eam quam habent in Christo Jesu, publice significant, et testificentur. Itaque si quis fuisset, qui spectator tantum esse vellet, et a sacra communione abstineret, illum veteres patres⁴⁵, et Romanos episcopos in primitiva ecclesia, antequam nata esset privata missa, tanquam improbum atque ethnicum excommunicasse: neque ullum fuisse eo tempore hominem Christianum, qui, cæteris spectantibus, communicaret solus. Ita olim decrevit Calixtus⁴⁶, ut peracta consecratione, omnes communicarent, nisi mallent carere ecclesiasticis liminibus. Sic enim ait⁴⁷ apostolos statuisse, et sanctam Romanam ecclesiam tenere.

[Cap. 12, div.
3. v. p. 60.]

Populo vero ad sacram communionem accedenti, utramque partem eucharistiæ tradendam esse: id enim et Christum jussisse, et apostolos ubique terrarum instituisse, et omnes veteres patres, et catholicos episcopos secutos esse: et si quis contra faciat, eum, ut Gelasius ait, committere sacrilegium⁴⁸: et adversarios hodie nostros, qui explosa atque abdicata communione, sine verbo Dei, sine veteri concilio, sine ullo catholico patre, sine exemplo primitivæ ecclesiæ, sine etiam ratione, privatas missas et mutilationem⁴⁹ sacramentorum defendant, idque non tantum contra expressum

⁴⁵ Chrysost. ad Ephes. ser. 3. cap. 1. De Cons. dist. 1. cap. Omnes.

⁴⁶ Dist. 2. cap. Sæculares.

⁴⁷ De Cons. dist. 2. cap. Per-

acta.

⁴⁸ De Cons. dist. 1. cap. Commperimus.

⁴⁹ Alit. *multitudinem*.

mandatum et jussum Christi, sed etiam contra omnem antiquitatem faciant, improbe facere, et esse sacrilegos.

Panem et vinum dicimus esse sacra et cœlestia mysteria [Cap. 13. div. I. v. p. 67.] corporis et sanguinis Christi; et illis Christum ipsum, verum panem æternæ vitæ, sic nobis præsentem exhiberi, ut ejus corpus, sanguinemque per fidem vere sumamus: non tamen id ita dicimus, quasi putemus naturam panis et vini prorsus immutari atque abire in nihilum, quemadmodum multi proximis istis sæculis somniarunt, neque adhuc potuerunt unquam satis inter se de suo somnio convenire. Neque enim id Christus egit, ut panis triticeus abjiceret naturam suam, ac novam quandam divinitatem indueret; sed ut nos potius immutaret, utque Theophylactus ⁵⁰ loquitur, transelementaret in corpus suum. Quid enim magis perspicue dici potest, quam quod Ambrosius ait ⁵¹, Panis et vinum sunt quæ erant, et in aliud commutantur? aut quod Gelasius, Non desinit esse substantia panis, vel natura vini: aut quod Theodoretus ⁵², Post sanctificationem mystica symbola naturam suam propriam non abjiciunt: manent enim in priori sua substantia, et figura, et specie: aut quod Augustinus, Quod videtis, panis est et calix ⁵³, quod etiam oculi renunciant ⁵⁴: quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi, calix sanguis: aut quod Origenes ⁵⁵, Ille panis qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei, quod quidem ad materiam attinet, in ventrem abit, et in secessum ejicitur: aut quod Christus non tantum post consecrationem calicis, sed etiam post communicationem ⁵⁶ dixit, Non bibam amplius de hac generatione vitis ⁵⁷. Certum enim est ex vite progenerari vinum, non sanguinem. Nec tamen cum ista [Cap. 14. div. I. v. p. 137.] dicimus, extenuamus cœnam Domini, aut eam frigidam tantum cæremoniam esse docemus, et in ea nihil fieri; quod multi nos docere calumniantur. Christum enim asserimus, vere sese præsentem exhibere in sacramentis suis: in baptismo, ut eum induamus: in cœna, ut eum fide et spiritu comedamus, et de ejus cruce ac sanguine habeamus vitam

⁵⁰ In Joh. vi.

manducant.

⁵¹ De Sacram. lib. iv. c. 4.

⁵⁵ In Mat. xv. 11.

⁵² In Dialog. 1. et 2.

⁵⁶ Alit. *communione*.

⁵³ In Sermon. ad Infan.

⁵⁷ Luc. xxii. 18.

⁵⁴ De Cons. dist. 2. cap. Qui

[PART. II.]

æternam: idque dicimus non perfunctorie, et frigide, sed re ipsa et vere fieri. Etsi enim Christi corpus dentibus et faucibus non attingimus, cum tamen fide, mente, spiritu, tenemus et prenimus. Neque vero vana ea fides est, quæ Christum complectitur, nec frigide percipitur, quod mente, fide, et spiritu percipitur. Ita enim nobis in illis mysteriis, Christus ipse totus, quantus quantus est, offertur et traditur, ut vere sciamus, esse jam nos carnem de ejus carne, et os de ossibus ejus, et Christum in nobis manere, et nos in illo.

[Cap. 14. div.
2. v. p. 154.]

Itaque in peragendis mysteriis antequam ad sacram communionem veniatur, recte admonetur populus, ut sursum⁵⁸ habeant corda, et animos in cælum dirigant: ibi enim esse

[Cap. 14. div.
3. v. p. 160.]

illum, de quo nos oporteat satiari ac vivere. Et Cyrillus in percipiendis mysteriis, excludendas esse ait crassas cogita-

[Cap. 14. div.
4. v. p. 165.]

tiones. Et concilium Nicænum, ut græce citatur a quibusdam, diserte vetat, ne humiliter intenti simus ad propositum

[Cap. 14. div.
5. v. p. 171.]

panem et vinum. Et ut Chrysostomus recte scribit, corpus Christi dicimus esse cadaver, nos oportere esse aquilas, ut intelligamus in altum subvolandum esse, si velimus ad Christi corpus accedere: hanc enim aquilarum esse mensam, non graculorum. Et Cyprianus, Hic, inquit⁵⁹, panis

[Cap. 14. div.
6. v. p. 178.]

cibus mentis est, non cibus ventris. Et Augustinus, Quomodo, inquit⁶⁰, tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cælum mittam manum, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem, inquit, mitte, et tenuisti.

[Cap. 15. div.
1. v. p. 182.]

Nundinationes vero et auctiones missarum, et circumgestionem, atque adorationes panis, et alias idololatricas et blasphemias ineptias, quas nemo istorum affirmare potest Christum et apostolos tradidisse, in ecclesiis nostris non ferimus: et episcopos Romanos recte reprehendimus, qui sine verbo Dei, sine autoritate sanctorum patrum, sine exemplo, novo more, non tantum proponunt populo panem eucharisticum divino cultu adorandum⁶¹, sed etiam illum in equo gradario, quocunque ipsi iter faciunt, ut olim ignem Persicum, aut Isidis sacra, circumferunt, et Christi sacra-

⁵⁸ De Cons. dist. 1. cap. Quando.

⁵⁹ De Cæna Domini.

⁶⁰ In Joan. tract. 50.

⁶¹ Libro de Cæremoniis Ecclesiæ Rom.

menta ad scenam jam, et pompam traduxerunt; ut in ea re, in qua mors Christi inculcanda et celebranda erat, et in qua mysteria redemptionis nostræ sancte ac reverenter erant agitanda, hominum oculi nihil aliud quam insanis spectaculis, et ludicra levitate pascerentur. Quod autem dicunt, et interdum etiam stultis persuadent, sese missis suis posse distribuere atque applicare hominibus (sæpe etiam nihil de ea re cogitantibus, nec quid agatur intelligentibus) omnia merita mortis Christi, et ridiculum, et ethnicum, et ineptum est. Fides enim nostra mortem et crucem Christi nobis applicat, non actio sacrificuli: Fides, inquit Augustinus, sacramentorum justificat, non sacramentum. Et Origenes⁶², Ille, inquit, est sacerdos, et propitiatio, et hostia, quæ propitiatio ad unumquemque venit per viam fidei. Atque ad hunc modum, sine fide, ne vivis quidem prodesse dicimus sacramenta Christi: mortuis vero multo minus. Nam quod de purgatorio isti suo jactare solent, etsi illud scimus, non ita novum esse, tamen non aliud quam fatuum et anile commentum est. Augustinus⁶³ quidem, modo hujusmodi quendam locum esse, ait; modo posse esse, non negat; modo dubitat, modo prorsus pernegat, et in eo homines humana quadam benevolentia putat falli. Tamen ab hoc errore uno, tanta crevit seges sacrificulorum, ut cum in omnibus angulis missæ palam et publice venderentur, templa Dei facta fuerint tabernæ meritoria, et miseris mortalibus persuasum fuerit, nihil prorsus esse vendibilius: istis quidem certe nihil erat utilius.

[Cap. 15. div. 2. v. p. 192.]

[Cap. 16. div. 1. v. p. 198.]

[Cap. 16. div. 2. v. p. 205.]

De multitudine otiosarum cæremoniarum, scimus Augustinum⁶⁴ graviter suo tempore conquestum esse. Itaque nos magnum earum numerum resecavimus, quod illis sciremus affligi conscientias hominum, et gravari ecclesiam Dei.

[Cap. 17. div. 1. v. p. 214.]

Retinemus tamen et colimus, non tantum ea quæ scimus tradita fuisse ab apostolis, sed etiam alia quædam, quæ nobis videbantur sine ecclesiæ incommodo⁶⁵ ferri posse: quod omnia cuperemus in sacro cœtu, ut Paulus jubet⁶⁶,

⁶² Ad Rom. cap. 3. lib. iii.

lib. Hypognosticon 5.

⁶³ Aug. in Psal. 85. In Enchiridio, cap. 67. De Civitate Dei, lib. xxi. c. 26. Contra Pelagianos,⁶⁴ Ad Janu. Epist. 119.⁶⁵ Alit. fieri posse.⁶⁶ 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

[PART. II.]

decenter, atque ordine administrari. Ea vero omnia, quæ aut valde superstitiosa, aut frigida, aut spurca, aut ridicula, aut cum sacris literis pugnantia, aut etiam sobriis hominibus indigna esse videbamus, qualia infinita sunt hodie in papatu, prorsus sine ulla exceptione repudiavimus: quod nollemus Dei cultum ejusmodi ineptiis longius contaminari.

[Cap. 18, div.
I. v. p. 218.]

Precamur ea lingua, quam nostri, ut par est, omnes intelligant: ut populus, quemadmodum Paulus monet⁶⁷, e communibus votis utilitatem communem capiat: quemadmodum omnes pii patres, et catholici episcopi, non tantum in Veteri, verum etiam in Novo Testamento, et precati sunt ipsi, et populum precari docuerunt: ne, ut Augustinus ait, tanquam psittaci et merulæ, videamur sonare quod nescimus.

Mediatorem et precatorem, per quem accedendum sit ad Deum Patrem, non alium habemus quam Jesum Christum, cujus unius nomine omnia a Patre impetrantur. Turpe autem et plane ethnicum est, quod in istorum ecclesiis videmus passim fieri, non tantum quod infinitum numerum habere volunt precatorum, idque prorsus sine autoritate verbi Dei, (ut, quemadmodum Hieremias ait⁶⁸, divorum numerus æquet nunc, vel potius superet numerum civitatum, et miseri mortales nesciant, ad quem se potissimum debeant vertere :) quodque, cum tot sint ut numerari non possint, illis tamen singulis suum cuique ab illis munus et officium, quid impetrare, quid dare, quid efficere debeant, descriptum est: sed etiam quod ita, non tantum impie, sed etiam impudenter appellant Virginem matrem, ut se matrem⁶⁹ esse meminerit, ut imperet Filio, ut in illum utatur jure suo.

[Cap. 19, div.
I. v. p. 232.]

Dicimus hominem natum esse in peccato, et in peccato vitam agere: neminem posse vere dicere, mundum esse cor suum: justissimum quemque servum esse inutilem: legem Dei perfectam esse, et a nobis requirere perfectam et plenam obedientiam: illi a nobis in hac vita satisfieri non posse ullo modo: neque esse mortalium quenquam, qui

⁶⁷ 1 Cor. xiv.⁶⁸ Hier. ii. 28, et xi. 13.⁶⁹ Bernardus.

possit in conspectu Dei propriis viribus justificari: itaque unicum receptum nostrum et perfugium esse ad misericordiam Patris nostri per Jesum Christum, ut certo animis nostris persuadeamus, illum esse propitiationem pro peccatis nostris: ejus sanguine omnes labes nostras deletas esse: illum pacificasse omnia sanguine crucis suæ: illum unica illa hostia, quam semel obtulit in cruce, omnia perfecisse, et ea causa, cum animam ageret, dixisse, Consummatum est⁷⁰: quasi significare vellet, persolutum jam esse pretium pro peccato humani generis.

Hoc sacrificium siqui sunt qui non putant esse satis, eant sane et quærant aliud melius. Nos quidem, et quia illud unicum esse scimus, uno contenti sumus, nec expectamus aliud: et quia semel tantum offerendum erat, non jubemus repeti; et quia plenum et omnibus numeris et partibus perfectum erat, non substituimus continentes hostiarum successiones.

Quamvis autem dicamus, nihil nobis esse præsidii in operibus et factis nostris, et omnem salutis nostræ rationem constituamus in solo Christo; non tamen ea causa dicimus, laxè et solute vivendum esse, quasi tingi tantum et credere, satis sit homini Christiano, et nihil ab eo aliud expectetur. Vera fides viva est, nec potest esse otiosa.

Sic ergo docemus populum: Deum vocasse nos, non ad luxum et libidinem; sed, ut Paulus ait⁷¹, ad opera bona, ut in illis ambulemus: Deum eripuisse nos a potestate tenebrarum, ut serviamus Deo viventi, ut rescindamus omnes reliquias peccati, ut in timore et tremore operemur salutem nostram, ut appareat Spiritum sanctificationis esse in membris nostris, et Christum ipsum per fidem in cordibus nostris habitare.

Postremo, credimus hanc ipsam carnem nostram, in qua vivimus, quamvis mortua abierit in pulverem, tamen ultimo die reducturam esse ad vitam, propter Spiritum Christi qui habitat in nobis. Tum vero, quicquid hic interim patimur ejus causa, Christum abstersurum esse omnem lacrymam ab oculis nostris: et nos propter illum fruituros esse æterna vita, et semper futuros cum illo in gloria. Amen.

⁷⁰ Joh. xix. 30.

⁷¹ Eph. ii. 10.

[Cap. 20. div.
I. v. p. 238.]

[Cap. 21. div.
I. v. p. 250.]

[PART.
III.][Cap. 1. div.
1. v. p. 260.]

Istæ sunt horribiles illæ hæreses, quarum nomine bona pars orbis terrarum hodie a pontifice inaudita condemnatur. In Christum potius, in apostolos, in sanctos patres lis intendenda fuit. Nam ab illis ista non tantum perfecta, sed etiam constituta sunt: nisi isti forte velint dicere (quod etiam fortasse dicent) Christum non instituisse sacram communionem, ut inter fideles distribueretur: aut apostolos Christi, veteresque patres dixisse privatas missas in omnibus angulis templorum, modo denas, modo vicens, uno die: aut Christum et apostolos abegisse omnem plebem a sacramento sanguinis: aut id, quod ab ipsis hodie ubique fit (atque ita fit, ut eum condemnent pro hæretico, qui secus faciat), a Gelasio suo non appellari sacrilegium: aut non esse ista verba Ambrosii, Augustini, Gelasii, Theodoreti, Chrysostomi, Origenis, panem et vinum in sacramentis manere eadem quæ fuerant: illud, quod videtur in sacra mensa, esse panem: non desinere esse substantiam panis, et naturam vini: panis substantiam et naturam non mutari: aut illum ipsum panem, quod quidem ad materiam attinet, abire in ventrem, et in secessum ejici: aut Christum, apostolos, et sanctos patres, non precatos esse ea lingua, quæ a populo intelligeretur: aut Christum unica illa hostia quam semel obtulit, non omnia perfecisse: aut illud sacrificium fuisse imperfectum, ut nunc nobis opus sit alio. Hæc illis omnia dicenda sunt, nisi forte malint hoc dicere, omne jus et fas esse conclusum in scrinio peccatoris pontificii: quodque olim quidam ex ejus asseclis⁷² et parasitis non dubitavit dicere, illum posse dispensare contra apostolum, contra concilium, contra canones apostolorum: et istis exemplis atque institutis et legibus Christi non teneri.

[Cap. 1. div.
2. v. p. 267.][Cap. 1. div.
3. v. p. 271.]

Ista nos didicimus a Christo, ab apostolis, et sanctis patribus, et eadem bona fide docemus populum Dei: atque ea causa hodie ab antistite, scilicet, religionis, appellamur hæretici.

O Deum immortalem! Ergo Christus ipse, et apostoli, et tot patres una omnes erraverunt? Ergo Origenes, Am-

⁷² Dist. 36 [leg. 35.], Lector: in Glossa. Dist. 81 [l. 82.], Presbyter.

brosius, Augustinus, Chrysostomus, Gelasius, Theodoretus ^[PART. III.] erant desertores fidei catholicæ? Ergo tot veterum episcoporum et doctorum virorum tanta consensio nihil aliud erat quam conspiratio hæreticorum? Aut quod tum laudabatur in illis, id nunc damnatur in nobis? Quodque in illis erat catholicum, id nunc, mutatis tantum hominum voluntatibus, repente factum est schismaticum? Aut quod olim erat verum, nunc statim, quia istis non placet, erit falsum? Proferant ergo aliud evangelium: aut causas ostendant, cur ista quæ tam diu in ecclesia Dei publice observata, et approbata fuerint, nunc demum oportuerit revocari. Nos quidem illud verbum quod a Christo patefactum, et ab apostolis propagatum est, scimus et ad salutem nostram, et ad omnem veritatem propugnandam, et ad omnem hæresin convincendam esse satis. Ex illo nos solo omne genus veterum hæreticorum, quos isti nos aiunt ab inferis revocasse, condemnamus: et Arianos, Eutychianos, Marcionitas, Ebionæos, Valentinianos, Carpocratianos, Tatianos, Novatianos, eosque uno verbo omnes, qui vel de Deo Patre, vel de Christo, vel de Sancto Spiritu, vel de ulla alia parte religionis Christianæ impie senserunt, quia ab evangelio Christi coarguuntur, impios et perditos pronuntiamus, et usque ad inferorum portas detestamur: nec id solum, sed etiam, si forte erumpant uspiam, et sese prodant, eos legitimis et civilibus suppliciis severe et serio coercemus.

Fatemur quidem novas quasdam, et antea non auditas ^[Cap. 2. div. I. v. p. 275.] sectas, Anabaptistas, Libertinos, Mennonios, Zuenkfeldianos, statim ad exortum evangelii extitisse. Verum agimus Deo nostro gratias, satis jam orbis terrarum videt, nos nec peperisse, nec docuisse, nec aluisse ista monstra. Lege sodes, quisquis es, libros nostros: prostant ubique venales. Quid unquam scriptum est a quoquam nostrorum hominum, quod posset aperte istorum favere insanix? Immo nulla hodie regio ita libera est ab istis pestibus, atque illæ sunt, in quibus libere et publice docetur evangelium. Quod si rem ipsam attente et recte putare velint, magnum hoc argumentum est, esse hanc evangelii veritatem, quam nos docemus. Nam nec lolium facile sine frumento nasci solet, nec palea sine grano. Statim ab apostolorum ip-

[PART.
III.]

sorum temporibus, cum primum propagaretur evangelium, quis nescit quot hæreses una exortæ fuerint? Quis unquam antea audierat Simonem, Menandrum, Saturninum, Basilidem, Carpocratem, Cerinthum, Ebionem, Valentinum, Secundum, Marcosium, Colorbasium, Heracleonem, Lucianum, Severum? Et quid istos commemoramus? Epiphanius numerat octoginta, Augustinus plures etiam distinctas hæreses, quæ una creverint cum evangelio. Quid ergo? An evangelium, quod una cum illo hæreses nascerentur, non erat evangelium? aut Christus ea causa non erat Christus?

Neque tamen apud nos, uti diximus, pullulat ista seges, qui publice et libere docemus evangelium. Apud adversarios nostros, in cæcitate ac tenebris istæ pestes exordiuntur, et incrementa ac vires capiunt, ubi veritas tyrannide sævitiaeque opprimitur, nec nisi in angulis, et occultis congressionibus⁷³ audiri potest. Faciant sane periculum: dent cursum liberum evangelio, luceat veritas Jesu Christi, et radios in omnes partes porrigat; statim videbunt, ut nocturnam caliginem ad adspectum solis, ita istas umbras ad lucem evangelii protinus evanuisse. Nam nos quidem omnes illas hæreses, quas isti nos alere et fovere calumniantur, illis interim sedentibus atque aliud agentibus, quotidie repellimus et propulsamus.

[Cap. 3. div.
1. v. p. 2^oo.]

Quod autem dicunt nos in varias sectas abiisse, et velle alios Lutheranos, alios Zuinglianos appellari, neque adhuc potuisse satis inter nos ipsos de summa doctrinæ convenire: quid illi dixissent, si primis illis temporibus apostolorum, et sanctorum patrum extitissent? cum alius diceret, Ego sum Pauli; alius, Ego sum Cephæ: alius, Ego sum Apollo: cum Paulus Petrum reprehenderet: cum simultatis causa Barnabas a Paulo discederet: cum, ut autor est Origenes, Christiani in tot jam factiones distracti essent, ut nomen tantum Christianorum commune, aliud autem præterea nihil Christianorum simile retinerent: utque Socrates ait, dissensionum et sectarum causa in theatris a populo publice riderentur: cumque, ut ait imperator Constantinus, tot

⁷³ Alit. congressibus.

essent dissensiones et rixæ in ecclesia, ut ea calamitas vi-^[PART. III.]
deri possit omnem aliam superiorem calamitatem supe-
rasse : cum Theophilus, Epiphanius, Chrysostomus, Augus-
tinus, Ruffinus, Hieronymus, omnes Christiani, omnes
patres, omnes catholici, acerbissimis, atque etiam implaca-
bilibus inter se contentionibus conflictarentur : cum, ut
Nazianzenus ait, ejusdem corporis membra inter se consu-
merentur : cum oriens ab occidente de fermentato, et de
paschate, non ita magnis de rebus, scinderetur : cum in
omnibus conciliis nova subinde symbola, et nova decreta
cuderentur? Quid isti tum dixissent? Ad quos se potis-^[Cap. 4. div. I. v. p. 283.]
simum applicuissent? Quos fugissent? Cui evangelio credi-
dissent? Quos pro hæreticis, quos pro catholicis habu-
issent? Nunc duo tantum nomina, Lutherus et Zuinglius,
quas istis tragædias excitant? Ut quoniam illi duo de re
aliqua nondum consentiunt, idcirco utrumque errasse,
neutrum habuisse evangelium, neutrum vere ac recte do-
cuisse arbitremur?

Verum, ô Deus bone, quinam isti tandem sunt, qui dis-^[Cap. 5. div. I. v. p. 288.]
sensiones in nobis reprehendunt? An vero omnes isti inter
se consentiunt? An singuli satis habent constitutum quid
sequantur? An inter illos nullæ unquam dissensiones, nullæ
lites extiterunt? Cur ergo Scotistæ et Thomistæ de merito
congrui et condigni : de peccato originis in beata Virgine,
de voto solenni et simplici, non melius inter se conve-
niunt? Cur canonistæ auricularem confessionem de jure
humano, et positivo esse aiunt, scholastici contra, de jure
divino? Cur Albertus Pighius a Cajetano, Thomas a Lom-
bardo, Scotus a Thoma, Ochamus a Scoto, Alliensis⁷⁴ ab
Ochamo, Nominales a Realibus dissentiunt? Utque taceam
tot dissensiones fraterculorum, et monachorum (quod alii
in piscibus, alii in oleribus, alii in calceis, alii in crepidis,
alii in linea veste, alii in lanea sanctitatem constituunt :
alii albat, alii pullati, alii latius, alii angustius rasi : alii
soleati, alii nudipedes : alii cincti, alii discincti ambulant :)
meminisse debent esse aliquos⁷⁵ ex suis qui dicant, Christi

⁷⁴ [Al. *Alliæensis*.]

⁷⁵ Ste. Gardinerus in *Sophistica* tatio Berengarii, Schola et Glossa.
Diaboli. Richard. Faber. Recan- Guimundus. De Consec. dist. 2.
Ego Beren.

[PART.
III.]

corpus adesse in cœna naturaliter: contra ex iisdem illis suis esse alios qui negent: esse alios qui dicant, corpus Christi in sacra communione dentibus nostris lacerari et atteri: rursus esse alios, qui negent: esse alios qui scribant, corpus Christi in eucharistia esse quantum, esse alios contra qui negent: esse alios qui Christum divina quadam potentia: alios qui benedicendo: alios qui⁷⁵ quinque conceptis verbis, alios qui eadem illa quinque verba repetendo, dicant consecrasse: esse alios qui in illis quinque verbis, [hoc] pronomine demonstrativo, putent panem triticeum: alios qui malint vagum quoddam individuum indicari: esse alios⁷⁶ qui dicant canes et mures posse vere et reipsa comedere corpus Christi: esse alios qui id constanter pernegent: esse alios⁷⁷ qui dicant, accidentia ipsa panis vinique nutrire posse: esse alios qui dicant, redire substantiam? Quid plura? Prolixum et permolestum esset omnia numerare. Ita universa forma horum religionis et doctrinæ, adhuc apud illos ipsos a quibus nata et profecta est, prorsus incerta, et controversa est. Vix enim unquam inter se conveniunt, nisi forte, ut olim Pharisei et Sadducæi, aut Herodes et Pilatus, contra Christum.

[Cap. 6. div.
I. V. p. 304.]

Eant ergo sane, et pacem potius inter suos domi sanciant. Unitas quidem et consensio maxime convenit religioni. Non tamen est ea certe et propria nota ecclesiæ Dei. Summa enim erat consensio inter eos qui adorabant aureum vitulum. et inter eos qui conjunctis vocibus in Servatorem nostrum Jesum Christum clamabant, Crucifige. Neque quia Corinthii dissensionibus inter se laborabant, aut quia Paulus a Petro, aut Barnabas a Paulo, aut Christiani statim sub ipsis initiis evangelii aliqua de re a se mutuo dissidebant, idcirco nulla erat inter eos ecclesia Dei. Illi quidem, quos isti contumeliæ causa appellant Zuinglianos, et Lutheranos, (re autem vera sunt utrique Christiani, et inter sese amici, ac fratres): non de principiis aut fundamentis religionis nostræ, non de Deo, non de Christo, non de Sancto Spiritu, non de ratione justificationis, non de

⁷⁵ Thomas.⁷⁶ Gardinerus.⁷⁷ De Cons. dist. 2. Species.
Glossa.

æterna vita : tantum de una, nec ea ita gravi aut magna quæstione, inter se dissentiunt. Nec desperamus, vel potius non dubitamus, brevi fore concordiam : et siqui sint, qui aliter sentiant quam par est, positis aliquando affectionibus et nominibus, Deum id illis esse patefacturum, ut re melius animadversa atque explorata, quod olim in Chalcedonensi concilio factum est, omnes dissensionum causæ et fibræ ab ipsis radicibus extirpentur, et ἀμνηστία sepeliuntur sempiterna. Amen.

Gravissimum vero est, quod nos dicunt esse homines impios, et omnem religionis curam abjecisse : quanquam non debet id multum nos movere, quod illi ipsi, a quibus objicitur, sciunt contumeliosum et falsum esse. Nam Justinus Martyr autor est, cum primum evangelium cœptum esset publicari, et Christi nomen pateferi, Christianos omnes dictos fuisse ἀθέους. Cumque Polycarpus staret pro judicio, populus his vocibus incitavit proconsulem ad cædem et internecionem eorum omnium, qui evangelium profitebantur⁷⁸, Ἀἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους, hoc est, Tolle de medio istos homines impios, qui Deum non habent. Non quod Christiani Deum revera non haberent, sed quod saxa, et stipites, quæ tum pro diis colebantur, non adorarent. Verum orbis terrarum satis jam videt, quid nos nostrique ab istis, religionis, et unius Dei nostri causa, perpeSSI sumus. In carceres, in aquas, in ignes nos abjecerunt, et in nostro sanguine volutati sunt ; non quod aut adulteri essemus, aut latrones, aut homicidæ ; sed tantum quod agnosceremus evangelium Jesu Christi, et speraremus in Deum vivum, quodque nimium (ô Deus bone !) juste, vereque quereremur, traditionum inanissimarum causa violari ab istis legem Dei : et adversarios nostros, qui scientes et prudentes Dei jussa ita obstinate contemnerent, esse hostes evangelii, et inimicos crucis Christi.

Verum isti, quum viderent doctrinam nostram non posse recte accusari, maluerunt in mores nostros invehere : nos omnia recte facta damnare : ad licentiam et libidinem fores aperire : et populum ab omni studio virtutis abducere. Et

⁷⁸ Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 15.

[PART.
III.]

certe ea est, semperque fuit hominum omnium, etiam piorum et Christianorum, vita, ut semper etiam in optimis et castissimis moribus tamen aliquid posses desiderare : eaque propensio omnium ad malum, eaque omnium proclivitas ad suspicandum, ut quæ nec facta, nec cogitata unquam fuerint, audiri tamen, et credi possint. Utque in candidissima veste facile exigua notatur labes ; ita in vita candidissima, facile levissima nota turpitudinis deprehenditur. Neque nos, aut eos omnes qui amplexi sunt hodie doctrinam evangelii, angelos esse arbitramur, et prorsus sine macula ulla rugaque vivere : aut istos vel ita cæcos, ut si quid in nobis notari queat, non possint id vel per tenuissimam rimam animadvertere : vel ita candidos, ut quidquam velint in meliorem partem interpretari : vel ita ingenuos, ut oculos suos velint in se reflectere, et mores nostros de suis moribus æstimare. Quod si rem ipsam ab initiis velimus repetere, scimus temporibus ipsis apostolorum fuisse homines Christianos, propter quos nomen Domini blasphemaretur, et male audiret inter gentes.

Queritur apud Sozomenum imperator Constantius, multos postquam ad Christianam religionem accessissent, evasisse deteriores. Et Cyprianus lugubri oratione describit corruptelam sui temporis. Disciplinam, inquit⁸¹, quam apostoli tradiderant, otium jam et pax longa corruperat. Studebant augendo patrimonio singuli, et obliti quid crederent, aut sub apostolis ante fecissent, aut semper facere deberent, insatiabili cupiditatis ardore ampliandis facultatibus incubabant. Non in sacerdotibus religio devota, non in ministris fides integra, non in operibus misericordia, non in moribus disciplina. Corrupta barba in viris, in fœminis forma fucata. Et ante illum Tertullianus, O miseros, inquit, nos, qui Christiani dicimur hoc tempore ! Gentes agimus sub nomine Christi.

Postremo, ne omnes commemoremus, Gregorius Nazianzenus de miserabili statu suorum temporum ita loquitur : Vitiorum, inquit, nostrorum causa, odio jam laboramus inter gentes. Spectaculum etiam jam facti sumus, non solum

⁸¹ De Lapsis.

angelis et hominibus, sed etiam omnibus impiis. Hoc loco ^[PART III.] erat ecclesia Dei, cum primum lucere cœpisset evangelium, cum nondum rabies tyrannorum refrixisset, aut gladius a Christianorum hominum cervicibus ablatu esset. Scilicet, non est novum, homines esse homines, etiamsi appellentur Christiani.

Sed isti cum ita odiose nos accusant, nihilne interim de ^[PART IV.] se cogitant! An illi, quibus tam procul spectare, et quid in ^[Cap. i. div. i. v. p. 315.] Germania, quidque in Anglia agitur videre otium est, aut obliti sunt, aut videre non possunt quid agitur Romæ? An nos ab illis accusamur, de quorum vita nemo potest satis honeste et verecunde commemorare?

Nos quidem non sumimus id nobis hoc tempore, ut ea quæ una cum ipsis sepulta esse oportebat, in lucem et in conspectum proferamus. Non est id religionis, non est verecundiæ, non est pudoris nostri. Ille tamen qui se Christi vicarium et ecclesiæ caput dici jubet, qui audit ista Romæ fieri, qui videt, qui patitur, nihil enim aliud addimus, qualia ea sint facile potest cum animo suo cogitare. Redeat enim illi sane in memoriam: cogitet canonistas illos suos esse, qui populum docuerunt, simplicem fornicationem non esse peccatum⁸²: quasi illam doctrinam ex Mitione comico didicissent: Non est peccatum, mihi crede, adolescentulum scortari. Cogitet, suos illos esse, qui decreverunt, Sacerdotem fornicationis causa non esse summo-vendum⁸³. Meminerit cardinalem Campegium, Albertum Pighium, aliosque complures suos docuisse, sacerdotem illum multo sanctius et castius vivere, qui alat concubinam, quam qui uxorem habeat in matrimonio. Nondum ille, spero, oblitus est, multa esse Romæ publicarum meretricum millia, et se ex illis in singulos annos, vectigalis nomine, colligere ad triginta millia ducatorum. Oblivisci non potest, se Romæ lenocinium publice exercere, et de fœdissima mercede fœde ac nequiter delitieri. An omnia tum Romæ satis aut salva aut sancta erant, cum Joanna⁸⁴, fœmina integræ ætatis magis quam vitæ, esset

⁸² Johannes de Magistris de de Bigamis. Quia circa. Temperantia.

⁸³ 3. [*leg.* 2.] quæst. 7. Lata ⁸⁴ Statua ejusdem fœminæ par-turientis adhuc Romæ est.

[*leg.* Lator in margine]. Extrav.

[PART.
IV.]

papa, et sese gereret pro capite ecclesiæ: et cum se bienium totum in illa sancta sede aliorum libidini exposuisset, postremo in lustranda civitate, inspectantibus cardinalibus et episcopis, palam pareret in publico?

[Cap. 2. div. 1.
v. p. 363.]

Sed quid opus erat concubinas et lenones commemorare? vulgare enim jam illud Romæ et publicum, et non inutile peccatum est. Meretrices enim ibi jam sedent, non ut olim⁸⁵ extra civitatem, obnupto et obvoluto capite, sed in palatiis habitant, per forum vagantur aperta fronte, quasi id non tantum liceat, sed etiam laudi esse debeat. Quid plura? Illorum jam libidines terrarum orbi sunt satis notæ. D. Bernardus, de pontificis familia, ipsoque adeo pontifice, libere et vere scribit: Aula, inquit⁸⁶, tua, bonos recipit, non facit: mali ibi proficiunt, boni deficiunt. Et quicumque ille fuit, qui scripsit opusculum Tripartitum, quod adjunctum est ad concilium Lateranense; Tantus, inquit, hodie est luxus, non tantum in clericis et sacerdotibus, sed etiam in prælatis et episcopis, ut horribile sit auditu.

Atqui ista non tantum usitata sunt, et ea causa consuetudinis et temporis gratia approbata, (ut cætera sunt istorum fere omnia,) sed etiam antiqua jam et putida. Quis enim non audivit quid Petrus Aloisius, Pauli tertii filius, designarit in Cosmum Cherium episcopum Fanensem? quid Joannes Casus archiepiscopus Beneventanus, legatus pontificis apud Venetos, scripserit de horrendo scelere; et quod ne fando quidem audiri debeat, id verbis spurcissimis, et scelerata eloquentia commendarit? Quis non audivit N. [*al.* Alphonsum] Diazium Hispanum, cum ea gratia Roma missus fuisset in Germaniam, innocentissimum et sanctissimum virum Joannem Diazium fratrem suum, tantum quod amplexus esset evangelium Jesu Christi, et Romam redire nollet, nefarie atque impie interfecisse? Sed ista, inquier, in repub. optime constituta, etiam invitis magistratibus, possunt interdum accidere: et bonis legibus vindicantur.

Esto sane. Sed quibus bonis legibus animadversum est

⁸⁵ Gen. xxxviii. 14, 15. In Concilio Delectorum Cardinalium, tom. iii.

⁸⁶ De Consideratione, ad Eucilium Delectorum Cardinalium, genium.

in istas pestes? Petrus Aloisius cum ea flagitia, quæ diximus, designasset, semper fuit in sinu atque in deliciis apud patrem suum Paulum tertium. Diazus, interfecto fratre suo, pontificis ope ereptus est, ne in eum animadverteretur bonis legibus. Joannes Casus archiepiscopus Beneventanus adhuc vivit: inmo etiam Romæ, et in sanctissimi oculis et conspectu vivit. Occiderunt fratrum nostrorum infinitos numeros, tantum quod vere ac pure crederent in Jesum Christum. At ex illo tanto numero meretricum, scortatorum, adulterorum, quem unquam, non dico, occiderunt, sed aut excommunicaverunt, aut omnino attigerunt? An vero, libidines, adulteria, lenocinia, scortationes, parricidia, incestus, et alia nequiora Romæ peccata non sunt? Aut si sunt, in urbe Roma, in arce sanctitatis, a vicario Christi, a successore Petri, a sanctissimo patre ita facile et leniter, quasi peccata non sint, ferri possunt?

O sancti scribæ et Pharisei, quibus ista sanctitas nota non fuit! O sanctitatem et fidem catholicam! Non ista Petrus Romæ docuit: Paulus non ita Romæ vixit. Non illi lenocinium publice exercuerunt: non illi vectigal et censum a meretricibus exegerunt: non illi adulteros et parricidas palam et impune tolerarunt: non eos in sinum, non in concilium, non in familiam, non in Christianorum hominum cætum receperunt. Non debebant isti tantopere exaggerare vitam nostram. Consultius multo fuit, ut prius vel approbarent hominibus, vel certe occultius aliquanto tegerent vitam suam.

Nam nos quidem utimur priscis et avitis legibus, et quantum his moribus et temporibus, in tanta corruptela rerum omnium, potest fieri, disciplinam ecclesiasticam diligenter et serio administramus. Prostibula quidem meretricum, et concubinarum, aut scortatorum greges non habemus: nec adulteria matrimoniis anteponimus: nec lenocinium exercemus: nec de fornicibus stipendia colligimus: nec incesta, et flagitiosas libidines, nec Aloisios, nec Casos, nec Diazios parricidas impune ferimus. Nam si ista nobis placuissent, nihil opus erat, ut ab istorum societate, ubi ea vigent et habentur in pretio, discederemus, et ea causa in odia hominum, et in certissima pericula incurreremus.

[PART.
IV.]

Habuit Paulus quartus ante non ita multos menses Romæ in carcere aliquot fratres Augustinianos, et complures episcopos, et magnum numerum aliorum piorum hominum, religionis causa. Habuit tormenta: exercuit in illos quaestiones: nihil reliquit intentatum. Ad extremum ex illis omnibus, quot potuit mæchos, quot scortatores, quot adul-

[Cap. 3. div. 3.
v. p. 371.]

teros, quot incestos invenire? Sit Deo nostro gratia: etsi illi non sumus, quos esse oportebat, quosque profitemur, tamen quicumque sumus, si cum istis conferamur, vel vita nostra atque innocentia facile has calumnias refutabit. Nos enim non tantum libris et concionibus, sed etiam exemplis et moribus populum ad omne genus virtutis, et recte factorum cohortamur. Evangelium docemus non esse ostentationem scientiæ, sed legem vitæ: utque Tertullianus ait⁸⁹, Christianum hominem non loqui magnifice oportere, sed magnifice vivere; nec auditores, sed factores legis justificari

[Cap. 4. div. 1.
v. p. 374.]

apud Deum⁹⁰. Ad hæc omnia hoc etiam solent addere, idque omni conviciorum genere amplificare, nos esse homines turbulentos, regibus sceptrata de manibus eripere, populum armare, tribunalia evertere, leges rescindere, possessiones dissipare, regna ad popularem statum revocare⁹¹, sursum deorsum omnia confundere: breviter in repub. nihil integrum esse velle. O quoties his verbis inflammaverunt animos principum, ut illi in herba extinguerent lucem evangelii, priusque illud odisse inciperent, quam nosse possent: utque magistratus, quoties aliquem videret nostrum, toties se putaret hostem videre suum!

Molestum quidem nobis esset ita odiose accusari gravissimo crimine majestatis, nisi sciremus Christum ipsum aliquando, et apostolos, et infinitos alios homines pios et Christianos, vocatos fuisse in invidiam, eodem fere crimine. Nam Christus quidem quamvis docuisset dandum esse Cæsari quod esset Cæsaris: tamen accusatus est seditionis, quod res novas moliri, et regnum appetere diceretur: itaque occlamatum est pro tribunalibus publice adversus eum: "Si hunc dimittis, non es amicus Cæsaris⁹²." Et apostoli,

⁸⁹ In Apologet. 45.⁹⁰ Rom. ii. 13.⁹¹ Tertullian. in Apolog. 1, 2 et 3.⁹² Joan. xix. 12.

quamvis semper et constanter docuissent obtemperandum esse magistratibus, omnem animam superioribus potestatibus esse subditam; idque non tantum propter iram et vindictam, sed etiam propter conscientiam: tamen dicti sunt commovere populum, et multitudinem ad rebellionem incitare. Amanus hoc maxime pacto, genus et nomen Judæorum adduxit in odium⁹³ apud regem Assuerum, quod illos diceret esse populum rebellem et contumacem, et principum edicta et jussa contemnere. Impius rex Ahabus, Eliæ prophetæ Dei, “Tu” (inquit) “conturbas Israel⁹⁴.” Amasias sacerdos Bethel, apud regem Hieroboam accusat Amos prophetam conspiracy: “Ecce,” (inquit⁹⁵), “Amos conjurationem fecit contra te, in medio domus Israel.” Breviter, Tertullianus ait⁹⁶, adversus omnes Christianos hanc suo tempore accusationem fuisse publicam, esse illos proditores, esse perduelles, esse hostes humani generis.

Quare si nunc quoque veritas male audiat, et eadem cum sit, iisdem nunc contumeliis afficiatur, quibus affecta est olim; etsi id molestum et ingratum est, novum tamen aut insolens videri non potest.

Facile istis fuit ante annos quadraginta, ista maledicta, et alia graviora in nos confingere, cum in mediis illis tenebris exoriri primum cœpisset, et lucere radius aliquis ignotæ tum et inauditæ veritatis; cum Martinus Lutherus, et Huldericus Zuinglius, præstantissimi viri, et ad illustrandum orbem terrarum a Deo dati, primum accessissent ad evangelium: cum et res adhuc nova esset, et eventus incertus, et animi hominum suspensi atque attoniti, et aures apertæ ad calumnias, et nullum in nos tam grave flagitium fingi posset, quod non, propter rei ipsius novitatem atque insolentiam, facile a populo crederetur. Ita enim veteres hostes evangelii, Symmachus, Celsus, Julianus, Porphyrius, olim aggressi sunt accusare omnes Christianos seditionis, et majestatis, antequam aut princeps, aut populus, quinam illi Christiani essent, aut quid profi-

[Cap. 4. div. 2.
v. p. 379.]

⁹³ Hest. iii. 8, &c.

⁹⁴ 3 Reg. xviii. 18.

⁹⁵ Amos vii. 10.

⁹⁶ In Apol. cap. 37.

[PART.
IV.][Cap. 5. div. 1.
v. p. 383.]

terentur, aut quid crederent, aut quid vellent, scire possent. Nunc vero postquam etiam hostes nostri vident, et negare non possunt, nos semper omnibus dictis nostris, scriptisque diligenter admonuisse populum officii sui, ut principibus suis et magistratibus, quamvis impiis, obtemperarent, idque et usus ipse, et experientia satis docet, et omnium hominum, quicumque atque ubicumque sunt, oculi vident et contestantur; putidum erat ista objicere, et, cum nova et recentia crimina nulla essent, obsoletis tantum mendaciis nobis invidiam facere voluisse.

Agimus enim Deo nostro, cujus hæc solius causa est, gratias, in omnibus regnis, ditionibus, rebuspub. quæ ad evangelium accesserunt, nullum unquam adhuc hujusmodi exemplum extitisse. Nullum enim nos regnum evertimus: nullius ditionem aut jura minuimus: rempub. nullam turbavimus. Manent adhuc suo loco, et avita dignitate reges Angliæ nostræ, Daniæ, Suetiæ: duces Saxoniarum: comites Palatini: marchiones Brandeburgici: lantgravii Hessiæ: respub. Helvetiorum, et Rhætorum: et liberæ civitates, Argentina, Basilea, Francofordia, Ulma, Augusta, Norimberga, omnes eodem jure, eodemque statu quo fuerunt antea, vel potius, quia propter evangelium populum habent obsequentiores, multo meliores. Eant sane in illa loca, ubi nunc Dei beneficio auditur evangelium. Ubi plus majestatis? Ubi minus fastus et tyrannidis? Ubi princeps magis colitur? Ubi populus minus tumultuatur? Ubi unquam fuit publica res, ubi ecclesia tranquillior?

At rustici, inquires, a principio hujus doctrinæ passim cœperunt furere, et tumultuari per Germaniam. Esto. At in illos promulgator hujus doctrinæ Martinus Lutherus vehementissime atque acerrime multa scripsit, eosque ad pacem et ad obedientiam revocavit.

[Cap. 5. div. 2.
v. p. 387.]

Quod autem objici solet interdum ab hominibus imperitis rerum, de mutato statu Helvetiorum, et interfecto duce Austriæ Leopoldo, et patria in libertatem vindicata, factum est id (uti ex omnibus historiis satis constat) ante annos ducentos sexaginta, sub Bonifacio octavo, cum maxime vigeret potestas pontificum, ducentos circiter annos antequam Huldericus Zuinglius, aut docere inciperet evan-

gelium, aut omnino natus esset. Ex eo vero tempore semper illi omnia pacata et tranquilla habuerunt, non tantum ab hoste externo, sed etiam a tumultu intestino.

Quod si peccatum fuit patriam suam ab externa dominatione, praesertim cum insolenter et tyrannice opprimerentur, liberare: tamen vel nos alienis, vel illos avitis criminibus onerare, et iniquum, et absurdum est.

Sed o Deum immortalem! an Romanus episcopus accusabit nos perduellionis? An ille docebit populum obtemperare, atque obsequi magistratibus? Aut omnino rationem majestatis habet ullam? Cur ergo nunc ille, (quod nullus veterum episcoporum Romanorum unquam fecit,) quasi omnes reges et principes, quicumque atque ubicunque sint, velit esse servos suos, patitur se a suis parasitis⁹⁷, dominum dominantium appellari? Cur ille se jactat esse regem regum, et habere jus regium in subditos?

[Cap. 6. div. 1.
v. p. 388.]

Cur omnes imperatores et monarchas jurejurando adigit in verba sua? Cur majestatem⁹⁸ imperatoriam septuagies septies se inferiorem esse gloriatur; idque ea maxime causa, quod Deus duo lumina in cœlo fecerit: quodque cœlum et terra non in duobus principiis, sed in uno principio creata fuerint? Cur ille, ejusque⁹⁹ sectatores, anabaptistarum et libertinorum more, quo licentius et securius grassarentur, jugum excusserunt, et se ab omni civili potestate exemerunt?

Cur ille legatos suos, hoc est, callidissimos exploratores, habet tanquam in insidiis, in aulis, in conciliis, in cubiculis regum omnium? Cur ille, ubi visum est, principes Christianos inter se committit, et pro sua libidine turbat seditionibus orbem terrarum? Cur proscribit, et pro ethnico et pagano haberi vult, si quis princeps Christianus ab imperio suo discesserit: et indulgentias ita liberaliter pollicetur, si quis quacunque ratione interficiat hostem suum? An ille conservat imperia et regna, aut omnino consultum cupit otio publico? Ignoscere nobis debes, pie lector, si ista videmur acrius et vehementius agere quam deceat

⁹⁷ August. Steuchus. Anton. de Rosellis.

⁹⁹ De Major. et Obed. Unam sanctam.

⁹⁸ De Major. et Obed. Solit.

[PART.
IV.]

homines theologos. Tanta enim est rei indignitas, tantaque in pontifice, tamque impotens libido dominandi, ut aliis verbis aut tranquillius proponi non possit. Ille enim in publico concilio² ausus est dicere, omne jus regum omnium a se pendere. Ille ambitionis, et regnandi causa distraxit Romanum imperium; et commovit, ac laceravit orbem Christianum. Ille Romanos atque Italos, seque adeo ipsum jurejurando, quo imperatori Græco obstringebatur, perfide liberavit: et subditos ad defectionem sollicitavit: et Carolum Magnum Martellum e Gallia in Italiam evocavit: et eum novo more imperatorem fecit³. Ille Gallorum regem Chilpericum, non malum principem, tantum quod ipsi non placeret, de regno dejecit, et in ejus locum Pipinum surrogavit. Ille ejecto (si id efficere potuisset) Philippo Pulchro rege, decrevit atque adjudicavit regnum Galliæ⁴ Alberto regi Romanorum. Ille florentissimæ civitatis, et reipublicæ Florentiæ⁵, patriæ suæ, opes fregit, eamque e libero et tranquillo statu, unius libidini in manum tradidit. Ille cohortatione sua effecit, ut tota Sabaudia hinc ab imperatore Carolo quinto, inde a Gallorum rege Francisco, misere discerperetur, et infelici duci vix una civitas quo se reciperet, relinqueretur.

[Cap. 6. div. 4.
v. p. 417.]

Tædet exemplorum, et molestum esset omnia Romanorum pontificum egregie facta commemorare. Quarum, obsecro, partium erant illi, qui Henricum imperatorem veneno sustulerunt in eucharistia? qui Victorem papam in sacro calice? qui Joannem nostrum regem Angliæ in mensario poculo? Quicumque illi tandem, et quarumcunque partium fuerint, Lutherani certe, aut Zuingliani non fuerunt. Quis hodie summos reges et monarchas admittit

[Cap. 7. div. 2.
v. p. 414.][Cap. 7. div. 3.
v. p. 417.]

ad oscula beatorum pedum? Quis imperatorem jubet sibi adstare ad frænum: et Gallorum regem ad ferrum illud pensile quo in equum ascenditur? Quis⁶ Franciscum Dandalum, ducem Venetiarum, regem Cretæ ac Cypri, catenis vinctum abjecit sub mensam suam, ut ossa liguriret inter

[Cap. 7. div. 5.
v. p. 429.]

canes? Quis⁷ imperatori Henrico sexto Romæ diadema

² Clemens V. in Concil. Vientiensi. Leo papa III.

³ Zacharias papa.

⁴ Clemens papa VII.

⁵ Idem Clemens.

⁶ Sabellicus.

⁷ Cælestinus papa.

[PART.
IV.]

non manu, sed pede imposuit: et eodem pede rursus de-
jecit, atque etiam addidit, habere se potestatem et creandi
imperatores, et summovendi? Quis ⁸ Henricum filium ar-
mavit in imperatorem Henricum quartum patrem suum:
effecitque ut pater a filio suo caperetur, et detonsus atque
ignominiose habitus, conjiceretur in monasterium, et inedia,
ac mœrore contabesceret? Quis ⁹ cervices imperatoris
Frederici subjecit fœdum in modum pedibus suis: et quasi
id non esset satis, addidit etiam insuper ex Psalmis Davidis,
Super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis, conculcabis leo-
nem et draconem: quale exemplum spretæ et contemptæ
majestatis, nunquam antea ulla memoria auditum fuerat:
nisi forte vel in Tamerlane Scythia, homine fero et bar-
baro, vel in Sapore rege Persarum?

[Cap. 7. div. 6.
v. p. 430.][Cap. 8. div. 1.
v. p. 434.]

Omnes isti fuerunt papæ: omnes successores Petri:
omnes sanctissimi, quorum singulas voces, singula nobis
oporteat esse evangelia.

Si nos rei sumus majestatis, qui principes nostros coli-
mus, qui illis omnia, quantum quidem per verbum Dei
fas est, deferimus, qui pro illis precamur; quid ergo isti
sunt, qui non tantum hæc fecerunt omnia, quæ diximus,
sed etiam ea quasi optime facta comprobaverunt? An vero
illi aut ad hunc modum docent populum revereri magis-
tratum; aut satis verecunde possunt nos, tanquam homines
seditiosos, et perturbatores pacis publicæ, et majestatis con-
temptores accusare? Nam nos quidem nec jugum excu-
timus, nec regna movemus, nec reges aut facimus aut
dejicimus, nec imperia transferimus, nec regibus nostris
venena propinamus, nec illis pedes osculandos porrigimus,
nec pedibus nostris illorum cervicibus insultamus. Hæc
potius est professio, hæc est doctrina nostra; Omnem ani-
mam ¹⁰, quæcunque tandem ea sit, sive sit monachus, sive
evangelista, sive propheta, sive apostolus, oportere regibus
et magistratibus esse subditam: et pontificem adeo ipsum
(nisi evangelistis, nisi prophetis, nisi apostolis major videri
velit), quod veteres episcopi ¹¹ Romani melioribus tempo-

[Cap. 8. div. 2.
et 3. v. p.
439.]⁸ Hildebrandus papa.¹⁰ Chrysost. in 13. ad Roman.⁹ Alexander III. [*leg.* Inno-
centius.]¹¹ Greg. sæpe in epist.

[PART.
IV.]

ribus semper fecerunt, oportere imperatorem dominum suum et agnoscere, et appellare. Nos publice docemus, ita obtemperandum esse principibus, tanquam hominibus a Deo missis: quique illis resistit, illum Dei ordinationi resistere. Hæc sunt instituta nostra: hæc in libris, hæc in concionibus nostris, hæc in moribus, et modestia populi nostri elucescunt.

[Cap. 9. div.
I. et 2. v. p.
446.]

Illud vero, quod nos dicunt discessisse ab unitate ecclesiæ catholicæ, non tantum est odiosum, sed etiam, etsi verum non est, tamen speciem aliquam et similitudinem habet veri. Apud populum vero et imperitam multitudinem, non tantum vera et certa fidem faciunt, sed etiam si quæ sint, quæ videri possint verisimilia. Itaque videmus vafros homines, et callidos, quibus vera non suppeterent, semper verisimilibus pugnasse; ut qui rem ipsam penitus intueri non possent, specie saltem aliqua et probabilitate caperentur. Olim quod veteres Christiani¹¹, patres nostri, cum preces Deo adhiberent, ad orientem solem converterentur, erant qui dicerent, eos solem venerari, et habere pro Deo. Cumque illi dicerent, se, quod ad æternam et immortalem vitam attinet, non aliunde vivere, quam de carne et sanguine ejus Agni, qui non haberet labem, hoc est, Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi: invidi et inimici crucis Christi (quibus id tantum erat curæ, ut religio Christiana quacunque ratione male audiret) persuaserunt populo, esse eos homines impios, mactare humanas hostias, et sanguinem humanum bibere¹². Cumque illi dicerent, apud Deum nec marem esse nec fœminam, nec omnino, quod ad justitiam adipiscendam attinet, distinctionem esse ullam personarum, sequæ omnes inter se sorores fratresque salutarent; non deerant¹³ qui calumniarentur, Christianos nullum habere inter se discrimen aut ætatis, aut generis: sed omnes bestiarum ritu promiscue inter se concumbere. Et cum precationis et evangelii audiendi causa sæpe inter se in crypta, et abdita quædam loca convenirent; quod idem interdum ab hominibus conjuratis soleret fieri, rumores publice spargebantur, eos conspirare inter se, et habere consilia vel

¹¹ Tertull. in Apol. cap. 16. ¹² Idem, cap. 7—9. ¹³ Idem, cap. 39.

de occidendis magistratibus, vel de evertenda repub. Quodque ad agitando sacra mysteria, de instituto Christi adhiberent panem et vinum, putabantur a multis non Christum colere, sed Bacchum et Cererem¹⁴: quod illa numina ab ethnicis hominibus profana superstitione, simili ritu, pane et vino colerentur.

Credebantur ista a multis, non quod vera essent (quid enim esse posset minus?), sed quod essent verisimilia, et specie aliqua veri possent fallere.

Ita isti nos calumniantur esse hæreticos, ab ecclesia et Christi communione discessisse: non quod ista vera esse credant, (neque enim id illis curæ est,) sed quod ea hominibus imperitis possint aliqua forte ratione videri vera. Nos enim discessimus, non, ut hæretici solent, ab ecclesia Christi, sed, quod omnes boni debent, a malorum hominum et hypocritarum contagione. Hic tamen isti mirifice triumphant: illam esse ecclesiam: illam esse sponsam Christi: illam esse columnam veritatis: illam esse arcam Noe, extra quam nulla salus sperari possit: nos vero discessionem fecisse: Christi tunicam lacerasse: a corpore Christi avulsos esse; et a fide catholica defecisse. Cumque nihil relinquant indictum quod in nos, quamvis falso et calumniose, dici possit, hoc tamen unum non possunt dicere, nos vel a verbo Dei, vel ab apostolis Christi, vel a primitiva ecclesia descivisse.

Atqui nos Christi et apostolorum, et sanctorum patrum, primitivam ecclesiam semper judicavimus esse catholicam: nec eam dubitamus arcam Noe, sponsam Christi, columnam et firmamentum veritatis appellare, aut in ea omnem salutis nostræ rationem collocare.

Odiosum quidem est, a societate, cui assueveris, discedere; maxime vero illorum hominum, qui quamvis non sint, tamen videantur saltem, atque appellentur Christiani. Et certe nos istorum ecclesiam, qualiscunque tandem ea nunc est, vel nominis ipsius causa, vel quod in ea evangelium Jesu Christi, aliquando vere ac pure illustratum fuerit, non ita contemnimus: nec ab ea nisi necessario, et

¹⁴ Augustin.

[PART.
IV.][Cap. 9. div. 3.
v. p. 455.]

perinviti decessionem fecissemus. Sed quid si in ecclesia Dei idolum excitetur, et desolatio illa¹⁵ quam Christus futuram prædixit stet palam in loco sancto? Quid si arcam Noe prædo aliquis, aut pirata occupet? Certe isti, quoties ecclesiam nobis prædicant, se ipsos solos eam faciunt, et omnes illos titulos sibi ipsis adscribunt; atque ita triumphant, ut olim illi qui clamabant, “Templum Domini, templum Domini:” aut ut Pharisei et scribæ¹⁶, cum jactarent se esse filios Abrahami.

Ita inani splendore imponunt simplicibus, nosque nomine ipso ecclesiæ quærunt obruere: ut si latro, occupata domo aliqua aliena, et vel vi exturbato, vel interfecto domino, eam postea adscribat sibi, et herilem filium de possessione dejiciat: aut si Antichristus, postquam occupabit templum Dei, dicat postea illud jam esse suum, et nihil ad Christum pertinere. Nam isti quidem cum in ecclesia Dei nihil ecclesiæ simile reliquerint, ecclesiæ tamen patroni et propugnatores videri volunt: prorsus ut Gracchus olim defendebat ærarium, cum largitionibus faciendis, et insanis sumptibus ærarium funditus effudisset. Nihil autem unquam tam impium aut absurdum fuit, quin ecclesiæ nomine facile tegi et defendi posset. Faciunt enim etiam vespæ favos; et impii cœtus habent similes ecclesiæ Dei.

At non quicunque dicuntur populus Dei, sunt statim populus Dei: nec quicunque sunt ex patre Israele, sunt omnes Israelitæ. Hæretici Ariani se solos¹⁷ jactabant esse catholicos: cæteros omnes modo Ambrosianos, modo Athanasianos, modo Johannitas appellabant. Nestorius, ut ait Theodoretus, cum esset hæreticus, tamen tegebat se *τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας προσήματι*, hoc est, specie quadam, ac velo orthodoxæ fidei. Ebion, quamvis sentiret cum Samaritanis, tamen ut Epiphanius ait, appellari volebat Christianus. Mahometani hodie, quamvis eos ex omnibus historiis satis constet, idque ipsi negare non possint, ab Agara ancilla ducere originem, tamen quasi oriundi sint a Sara muliere libera, et uxore Abrahami, nominis ipsius et stirpis causa, malunt appellari Saraceni.

¹⁵ Matt. xxiv. 15. ¹⁶ Joan. viii. 39. ¹⁷ Aug. Epist. 48. ad Vincen.

Ita pseudoprophetæ omnium temporum qui sese prophetis Dei, qui Esaïæ, qui Hieremiæ, qui Christo, qui apostolis opponebant, nihil unquam æque crepabant, atque nomen ecclesiæ. Neque eos alia de causa ita acerbe lace-
rabant, aut perfugas et apostatas appellabant, quam quod a sua societate discessissent, et instituta majorum non observarent. Quod si nos hominum tantum illorum, a quibus tum ecclesia regebatur, iudicium sequi, aliud autem nihil, nec Deum, nec ejus verbum spectare volumus: negari prorsus non potest, apostolos, quod a pontificibus et sacerdotibus, hoc est, ab ecclesia catholica defecissent, et illis invitis et reclamantibus, multa in religione innovassent, recte fuisse ab illis, et secundum leges condemnatos. Itaque, ut Antæum aiunt olim ab Hercule tollendum fuisse a Terra matre, antequam ab eo posset vinci: ita adversarii nostri, ab ista matre sua, hoc est, ab ista inani specie atque umbra ecclesiæ, quam præ se gerunt, levandi sunt: alioqui non possunt cedere verbo Dei. Itaque Hieremias, Nolite, inquit¹⁸, tantopere jactare, esse apud vos Templum Domini: vana ea fiducia est: sunt enim ista, inquit, verba mendacii. Et angelus in Apocalypsi: Dicunt, inquit¹⁹, se Judæos esse, at sunt synagoga Satanæ. Et Christus, cum Pharisei jactarent genus et sanguinem Abrahami: Vos, inquit²⁰, ex diabolo patre estis: Abrahamum enim patrem non refertis. Ac si illis ita diceret: "Non estis id quod tantopere dici vultis. Imponitis populo inanibus titulis, et ad evertendam ecclesiam abutimini nomine ecclesiæ." Quare hoc istos primum liquido et vere probasse oportuit: ecclesiam Romanam esse veram et orthodoxam ecclesiam Dei: eamque, ut hodie ab ipsis administratur, cum primitiva Christi, apostolorum, et sanctorum patrum ecclesia, quam non dubitamus fuisse catholicam, convenire. Nos quidem, si inscitiam, si errorem, si superstitionem, si cultum idolorum, si hominum inventa, eaque sæpe pugnancia cum sacris scripturis, judicassemus aut placere Deo, aut ad æternam salutem esse satis: aut si statuere potuissemus, verbum Dei, ad aliquot tantum annos fuisse scriptum, postea oport-

[Cap. 9. div. 4.
v. p. 460.][Cap. 10. div.
1. v. p. 461.][Cap. 10. div.
2. v. p. 465.]¹⁸ Hier. vii. 4.¹⁹ Apoc. ii. 9.²⁰ Joan. viii. 44.

[PART.
IV.][Cap. 11. div.
I. v. p. 468.][Cap. 12. div.
I. et 2. v. p.
471.]

tuisse abrogari: aut omnino, dicta et jussa Dei subjicienda esse voluntati humanæ, ut quicquid ille dicat, aut jubeat, nisi Romanus episcopus idem velit et jubeat, pro irrito et indicto habendum sit: si hæc in animum nostrum inducere potuissemus credere: fatemur nihil fuisse causæ, cur istorum societatem relinqueremus. Quod autem nunc fecimus, ut discederemus ab illa ecclesia, cujus errores testati, ac manifesti essent; quæque jam aperte discessisset a verbo Dei: neque tam ab ea, quam ab ejus erroribus; idque non turbulente aut improbe, sed tranquille ac modeste faceremus: nihil aut a Christo, aut ab apostolis fecimus alienum. Neque enim ea est ecclesia Dei, quæ infuscarì labe aliqua non possit, aut non interdum egeat instauratione: alioqui quid tot coitionibus et conciliis opus est; sine quibus, ut ait Ægidius²¹, stare fides Christiana non potest? Quoties enim, inquit, concilia intermittuntur, toties ecclesia a Christo derelinquitur. Aut si nihil periculi est, ne quid ecclesia detrimenti accipiat: quid opus est, ut nunc quidem est apud istos, inanibus nominibus episcoporum? Cur enim illi pastores appellantur, si oves nullæ sunt quæ possint errare? Cur vigiles, si civitas nulla est quæ possit prodi? Cur columnæ, si nihil est quod possit ruere? Statim ab initio rerum, ecclesia Dei cœpta est propagari, eaque instructa cœlesti verbo, quod Deus ipse fuderat ab ore suo: instructa sacris cæremoniis, instructa Spiritu Dei, instructa patriarchis et prophetis: atque ita continuata est ad ea usque tempora, cum Christus sese ostenderet in carne.

Sed, o Deum immortalem! quoties ea interim, et quam horribiliter obscurata atque imminuta est! Ubi enim ea tum fuit, cum omnis caro²² contaminasset viam suam super terram? Ubi ea fuit, cum ex omni mortalium numero, octo tantum essent homines, et ne illi quidem omnes casti ac pii, quos Deus a communi clade, atque interitu vellet esse superstites? Cum Elias propheta²³ ita lugubriter et acerbè quereretur, se solum ex omni terrarum orbe relictum esse, qui Deum vere, et rite coleret: cumque Esaias diceret²⁴,

²¹ In Lateran. Concil. sub
Julio.

²² Gen. vi. 12.

²³ 3 Reg. xix. 14.

²⁴ Esai. i. 21, 22.

Argentum populi Dei, hoc est, ecclesiae, factum esse scoriam: [PART. IV.]
et civitatem eam, quæ aliquando fidelis fuerat, factam esse meretricem; et in ea a capite usque ad calcem, in toto corpore nihil esse integrum: aut cum Christus diceret²⁵, Domum Dei a Phariseis et sacerdotibus factam esse speluncam latronum? Scilicet ecclesia, ut ager frumentarius, nisi exaretur, nisi subigatur, nisi colatur, nisi curetur, pro tritico carduos, et lolium, et urticas proferet. Itaque Deus subinde misit prophetas et apostolos, postremo etiam Christum suum, qui populum in viam reducerent, et ecclesiam vacillantem in integrum instaurarent. Neve quis dicat hæc [Cap. 13. div. I. v. p. 476.]
in lege tantum, in umbra atque in infantia contigisse, cum figuris et cæremoniis veritas tegetetur, cum nihil adhuc ad perfectum adductum esset, cum lex non in cordibus hominum, sed in lapidibus incideretur (etsi ridiculum est illud quoque; idem enim omnino erat etiam tum Deus, idem Spiritus, idem Christus, eadem fides, eadem doctrina, eadem spes, eadem hæreditas, idem fœdus, eadem vis verbi Dei: et Eusebius ait²⁶, Omnes fideles usque ab Adamo, re quidem ipsa Christianos fuisse, quamvis non ita dicerentur:) ne quis, inquam, ita dicat, Paulus apostolus jam tum in evangelio, in perfectione, in luce, similes errores et lapsus deprehendit; ut ad Galatas, quos jam antea instituerat, necesse habuerit ita scribere²⁷: Vereor ne inter vos frustra laboraverim, et vos frustra audiveritis evangelium.²⁸ Filioli mei, quos iterum parturio, donec Christus formetur in vobis. Nam de Corinthiorum ecclesia, quam illa fœde fuerit inquinata, nihil est necesse dicere. Jam vero, an Galatarum et Corinthiorum ecclesiae labi potuerunt, sola Romana ecclesia errare, et labi non potest? Certe Christus tanto ante præ- [Cap. 13. div. 2. v. p. 480.]
dixit²⁹ de ecclesia sua, fore aliquando tempus, cum desolatio staret in loco sancto. Et Paulus Antichristum ait³⁰ aliquando positurum esse tabernaculum suum in templo Dei: et futurum ut homines sanam doctrinam non sustinerent³¹, sed in ipsa ecclesia ad fabulas converterentur. Et Petrus futuros ait³² in ecclesia Christi magistros

²⁵ Matt. xxi. 13.²⁶ Eccl. Hist. lib. I. cap. 4.²⁷ Gal. iv. 11.²⁸ Ver. 19.²⁹ Matt. xxiv. 15.³⁰ 2 Thess. ii. 4.³¹ 2 Tim. iv. 3.³² 2 Pet. ii. 1.

[PART.
IV.]

mendaciorum. Et Daniel propheta, de ultimis temporibus Antichristi, Veritas, inquit³³, eo tempore prosternetur, et conculcabitur in terra. Et Christus tantam ait³⁴ fore calamitatem et confusionem rerum, ut etiam electi, si posset fieri, abducendi sint in errorem. Atque ista omnia futura, non apud Paganos aut Turcas, sed in loco sancto, in templo Dei, in ecclesia, in cœtu ac societate illorum, qui professuri sint nomen Christi.

[Cap. 14. div.
1. et 2. v. p.
485.]

Et, quamvis ista vel sola possint homini prudenti esse satis, ne temere patiatur imponi sibi nomine ecclesiæ, ut ne quid in cam ex verbo Dei velit inquirere: tamen multi etiam sæpe patres, viri docti et pii, vehementer questi sunt, hæc omnia suis temporibus accidisse. Deus enim in media illa caligine tamen voluit esse aliquos, qui, etsi non lucem ita conspicuam et illustrem darent, tamen quasi scintillam aliquam, quam homines in tenebris notare possent, accenderent.

Certe Hilarius, cum res adhuc incorruptæ quodammodo essent et integræ, tamen, Male, inquit³⁵, vos parietum amor cepit: male ecclesiam Dei in tectis ædificiisque veneramini: male sub iis pacis nomen ingeritis. Anne ambiguum est, in iis Antichristum esse sessurum? Montes mihi, et sylvæ, et lacus, et carceres, et voragines sunt tutiores: in illis enim prophetæ, aut manentes aut demersi, Dei Spiritu prophetabant.

Gregorius, quasi videret, atque animo prospiceret ruinam rerum, ad Joannem episcopum Constantinopolitanum, qui primus omnium se novo nomine salutari jusserat universalem episcopum totius ecclesiæ Christi, ita scripsit³⁶: Si ecclesia pendebit ab uno, tota corruct. Et quis est, qui non hoc jam olim factum viderit? Jam olim episcopus Romanus ecclesiam totam a se uno pendere voluit; quare mirum non est, si ea jam olim tota corruerit. Bernardus abbas, ante annos quadringentos, Nihil, inquit, jam integrum est in clero: superest ut reveletur homo peccati. Idem in conversione D. Pauli: Videtur, inquit, jam cessasse perse-

[Cap. 14. div.
3. v. p. 493.]³³ Dan. viii. 12.³⁴ Matt. xxiv. 24.³⁵ Contra Auxentium.³⁶ In regist. Epist. ad Mauricum, lib. iv. Epist. 32.

[PART.
IV.]

cutio: immo jam incipit persecutio ab illis, qui in ecclesia primas obtinent. Amici tui et proximi tui adversus te appropinquârunt et steterunt: a planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis, non est ulla sanitas. Egressa est iniquitas a senioribus iudicibus, vicariis tuis, qui videntur regere populum tuum. Non possumus jam dicere, Ut est populus, sic est sacerdos; quoniam non ita est populus, ut sacerdos. Heu, heu, Domine Deus! ipsi sunt in persecutione tua primi, qui videntur in ecclesia tua primatum diligere, et gerere principatum. Idem in Cantica³⁷: Omnes amici, omnes inimici: omnes necessarii, omnes adversarii: servi Christi, serviunt Antichristo. Ecce in pace mea amaritudo mea est amarissima. Rogerus Bacon, magni nominis vir, cum acri oratione perstrinxisset miserabilem statum sui temporis: Isti, inquit³⁸, tot errores Antichristum requirunt.

[Cap. 15. div.
1. v. p. 494.]

Gerson queritur, suo tempore omnem vim sacræ theologiæ, ad ambitiosum certamen ingeniorum, et meram sophisticam fuisse revocatam.

Fratres Lugdunenses, homines, quod quidem ad vitæ rationem attinet, non mali, Romanam ecclesiam, a qua tum una oracula omnia petebantur, fidenter solebant affirmare, esse meretricem illam Babylonicam, de qua tam perspicuæ extent prædictiones in Apocalypsi, et cætum inferorum.

Scio horum hominum autoritatem apud istos levem esse. Quid ergo, si illos testes advoco, qui solent ab ipsis adorari?

[Cap. 15. div.
3. v. p. 496.]

Quid si dico³⁹ Adrianum episcopum Romanum ingenue confessum esse, omnia ista mala a pontificio culmine cœpisse ruere?

Pighius in eo fatetur erratum esse, quod in missam, quam alioqui videri vult sacrosancam, abusus complures invecti sint: Gerson, quod multitudine levissimarum cæremoniarum vis omnis Spiritus Sancti, quam in nobis vigere oportuit, et vera pietas sit extincta. Græcia tota atque

[Cap. 15. div.
3. v. p. 498.]³⁷ Serm. 33.³⁸ In Libello de Idiomate Linguarum.³⁹ Platina.

[PART.
IV.]

Asia, quod pontifices Romani purgatoriorum suorum, et indulgentiarum nundinis, et vim hominum conscientiis attulerint, et illorum loculos expilaverint.

[Cap. 16. div.
I. v. p. 501.]

De tyrannide vero episcoporum Romanorum et fastu Persico, ut alios taceamus, (quos illi, quod vitia sua libere et ingenue reprehendant, hostium fortasse suorum loco numerabunt) illi ipsi, qui Romæ, in urbe sancta, in oculis sanctissimi patris egerunt vitam, et omnia ejus intima videre potuerunt, et nunquam a catholica fide discesserunt, Laurentius Valla, Marsilius Patavinus, Franciscus Petrarca, Hieronymus Savanarola, abbas Joachimus, Baptista Mantuanus, et ante istos omnes, Bernardus abbas, sæpe multumque conquesti sunt: ipsumque interdum pontificem, verene an falso nihil dicimus, certe non obscure significabant esse Antichristum.

[Cap. 17. div.
I. v. p. 509.]

Neque vero est, quod quisquam objiciat, fuisse illos Lutheri discipulos, aut Zuinglii: extiterunt enim non tantum annis, sed etiam sæculis aliquot, antequam illorum nomina audirentur. Videbant illi etiam tum errores irrepressisse in ecclesiam, eosque cupiebant emendatos. Et quid mirum, si ecclesia erroribus abducta fuerit; illo præsertim tempore, cum nec episcopus Romanus, qui summæ rerum solus præerat, nec alius fere quisquam, aut officium suum faceret, aut omnino officium suum intelligeret? Vix enim est credibile, illis otiosis et dormientibus, diabolum toto illo tempore, aut dormivisse perpetuo, aut fuisse otiosum. Quid enim illi interim fuerint, quaque fide curaverint domum Dei, ut nos taceamus, audiant saltem Bernardum suum: Episcopi, (inquit⁴¹) quibus nunc commissa est ecclesia Dei, non doctores sunt, sed seductores: non pastores, sed impostores: non prælati, sed Pilati.

Hæc Bernardus de pontifice, qui se summum appellabat, deque episcopis qui tum sedebant ad gubernaculum. Non erat ille Lutheranus, non erat hæreticus, ab ecclesia non discesserat: tamen episcopos illos, qui tum erant, non dubitavit seductores, impostores, Pilatos appellare. Jam

⁴¹ Ad Eugenium.

vero cum populus palam seduceretur, et oculis hominum Christianorum imponeretur, et Pilatus sederet pro tribunalibus, et Christum Christique membra ferro flammæque adjudicaret, O Deus bone, quo tum loco erat ecclesia Christi! Ex tot autem tamque crassis erroribus, quem unquam isti errorem repurgaverunt? aut quem omnino errorem agnoscere et confiteri voluerunt?

Sed quoniam isti suam esse affirmant universam possessionem ecclesiæ catholicæ; et nos, quod cum ipsis non sentiamus, appellant hæreticos; vide sane, ecclesia ista quam tandem habeat notam aut significationem ecclesiæ Dei. Neque vero Dei ecclesiam, si eam velis serio et diligenter quærere, est adeo difficile deprehendere. Est enim excelso et illustri loco⁴², in vertice montis posita, ædificata videlicet in fundamentis apostolorum et prophetarum. Ibi (inquit Augustinus⁴³) quæramus ecclesiam: ibi decernamus causam nostram. Utque alibi idem ait⁴⁴, Ecclesia ex sacris et canonicis scripturis ostendenda est: quæque ex illis ostendi non potest, non est ecclesia.

Nescio tamen quo pacto, reverentiane, an conscientia, an desperatione victoriæ, ut latro crucem, ita isti semper horrent et fugiunt verbum Dei. Neque id sane mirum. Ut enim cantharum aiunt in opobalsamo, odoratissimo alioqui unguento, facillime extinguere atque emori: ita illi causam suam in verbo Dei, tanquam in veneno, extinguere vident, et suffocari.

Itaque sacrosantas scripturas, (quas Servator noster Jesus Christus non tantum in omni sermone usurpavit, sed etiam ad extremum sanguine suo consignavit) quo populum ab illis, tanquam a re periculosa et noxia, minore negotio abigant, solent literam frigidam, incertam, inutilem, mutam, occidentem, mortuam appellare: quod nobis quidem perinde videtur esse, ac si eas omnino nullas esse dicerent. Sed addunt etiam simile quoddam non aptissimum; eas esse quodammodo nasum cereum⁴⁵, posse fingi flectique in omnes modos, et omnium instituto inservire. An pontifex

[Cap. 19. et
20. div. 1. v.
p. 522.]

⁴² [Esa. ii. 2. Eph. ii. 20.]

⁴³ De Unitate Eccl. c. 3.

⁴⁴ Cap. 4.

⁴⁵ Pighius in Hierarchia.

[PART.
IV.]

ista a suis dici nescit? aut tales se habere patronos non intelligit?

Audiat ergo quam sancte, quamque pie de hac re scribat Hosius quidam Polonus (ut ipse de se testatur) episcopus, certe homo disertus, et non indoctus, et acerrimus ac fortissimus propugnator ejus causæ. Mirabitur, opinor, hominem pium de illis vocibus quas sciret profectas ab ore Dei, vel tam impie sentire potuisse, vel tam contumeliose scribere; ita præsertim, ut eam sententiam non suam unius propriam videri vellet, sed istorum communem omnium.

Nos, inquit ⁴⁶, ipsas scripturas, quarum tot jam non diversas modo, sed etiam contrarias interpretationes afferri videmus, facessere jubeamus; et Deum loquentem potius audiemus, quam ut ad egena ista elementa nos convertamus, et in illis salutem nostram constituamus. Non oportet legis et scripturæ peritum esse, sed a Deo doctum. Vanus est labor qui scripturis impenditur. Scriptura enim creatura est, et egenum quoddam elementum. Hæc Hosius. Eodem prorsus spiritu atque animo, quo olim Montanus, aut Marcion, quos aiunt solitos esse dicere, cum sacras scripturas contemptim repudiarent, se multo et plura et meliora scire, quam aut Christus unquam scivisset, aut apostoli. Quid ergo hic dicam? O columina ⁴⁷ religionis! O præsides ecclesiæ Christi! An hæc ea reverentia vestra est, quam adhibetis verbo Dei? An nos sacras scripturas, quas D. Paulus ait divinitus afflatas esse, quas Deus tot miraculis illustrarit, in quibus Christi ipsius certissima vestigia impressa sint, quas omnes sancti patres, quas apostoli, quas angeli, quas Christus ipse Filius Dei, cum opus esset, pro testimonio citarit; an eas vos, quasi indignæ sint quæ a vobis audiantur, facessere jubebitis? hoc est, Deo ipsi, qui vobis in scripturis clarissime loquitur, silentium imponetis? aut illud verbum, quo uno, ut Paulus ait, reconciliamur Deo, quodque propheta David ait ⁴⁸ sanctum et castum esse, et in omne tempus esse duraturum, ege-

⁴⁶ Hosius de expresso verbo Dei.⁴⁷ [Alit. culmina.]⁴⁸ Psa. xix. 8.

num tantum, et mortuum elementum appellabitis? Aut in eo, quod Christus ⁴⁹ nos diligenter scrutari, quodque in oculis assidue habere jussit, omnem nostram operam dicetis frustra collocari? Et Christum, apostolosque, cum hortarentur populum ad sacras literas, ut ex illis abundarent in omni sapientia et scientia, voluisse hominibus fucum facere? Non est mirum, si isti nos nostraque omnia contemnant, qui Deum ipsum ejusque oracula ita parvi faciant. Insulsum tamen erat, ut nos læderent, injuriam eos tam gravem facere verbo Dei.

Tamen quasi hoc parum esset, comburunt etiam sacro-
sanctas scripturas, ut olim impius rex Aza, aut Antiochus, aut Maximinus; easque solent hæreticorum libros appellare: omninoque id videntur velle facere, quod olim Herodes, obtinendæ potentiæ suæ causa, in Judæa fecit. Is enim, cum esset Idumæus ⁵⁰, alienus a stirpe et sanguine Judæorum, haberi tamen cuperet pro Judæo, quo magis regnum illorum, quod ab Augusto Cæsare impetraverat, sibi, posterisque suis confirmaret; omnes genealogias, quæ apud illos in archivis ab Abrahamo usque diligenter fuerant asservatæ, et ex quibus facile nullo errore deprehendi posset, e quo quisque genere oriundus esset, jussit incendi et aboleri, videlicet, ne quid superesset in posterum, quo ipse notari posset alieni sanguinis. Ita prorsus isti, cum omnia sua, quasi ab apostolis, aut a Christo tradita, velint haberi in pretio; ne quid uspiam supersit, quod hujusmodi somnia, et mendacia, possit coarguere, aut incendunt, aut populo intervertunt sacras scripturas.

Recte sane, et valde in istos apposite scribit Chrysostomus⁵¹: Hæretici, inquit, claudunt januas veritati. Sciunt enim si illæ pateant, ecclesiam non fore suam. Et Theophylactus: Verbum, inquit, Dei est lucerna, ad quam fur deprehenditur. Et Tertullianus: Sacra, inquit, scriptura hæreticorum fraudes et furta vincit. Cur enim celant, cur supprimunt evangelium, quod Christus de tecto sonari voluit? Cur illud lumen abdunt sub modium, quod stare

[Cap. 21. div.
I. v. p. 537.][Cap. 21. div.
2 et 3. v. p.
547.][Cap. 21. div.
4. v. p. 548.]⁴⁹ Joh. v. 39.⁵⁰ Euseb. [Eccl. Hist. lib. 1. cap. 7.]⁵¹ In opere imperfecto.

[PART.
IV.]

[Cap. 21. div.
5 et 6. v. p.
549.]

oportuit in candelabro? Cur multitudinis imperitæ cæcitati atque inscitæ magis quam causæ bonitati confidunt! An putant, artes jam suas non videri? aut se nunc, quasi Gygis annulum habeant, posse ambulare inconspicuos?

[Cap. 21. div.
7. ibid.]

Satis jam omnes, satis vident, quid sit in illo scrinio pectoris pontificii: vel hoc ipsum argumento esse potest, non recte ab illis, non vere agi. Suspecta merito videri debet ea causa, quæ examen et lucem fugitat. Nam qui male facit, ut Christus ait, quærit tenebras et odit lucem. Animus bene sibi conscius ultro venit in conspectum, ut opera, quæ a Deo profecta sunt, videri possint. Illi autem non usque adeo cæci sunt, quin ut hoc satis videant, si scripturæ semel obtineant, actum esse statim de regno suo: utque olim aiunt idola dæmonum, a quibus omnia tum oracula petebantur, repente obmutuisse ad aspectum Christi, cum ille venisset in terras, ita nunc omnes artes suas ad aspectum evangelii statim esse ruituras. Antichristus enim non abjicitur, nisi claritate⁵³ adventus Christi.

[Cap. 22. div.
1. v. p. 552.]

Nos quidem non, ut isti solent, ad flammas confugimus, sed ad scripturas: nec illos ferro obsidemus, sed verbo Dei. Ex illo, ut Tertullianus ait, fidem alimus: ex illo

[Cap. 22. div.
2. v. p. 554.]

spem erigimus: ex illo fiduciam firmamus. Scimus enim, evangelium Jesu Christi esse vim Dei⁵⁴ ad salutem, et in illo esse æternam vitam: utque Paulus monet⁵⁵, ne angelum quidem Dei de cælo venientem audimus, si nos ab aliqua parte hujus doctrinæ conetur avellere. Immo, ut vir sanctissimus Justinus Martyr de se loquitur: Ne Deo quidem ipsi fidem haberemus, si aliud nos doceret evan-

[Cap. 22. div.
3. v. p. 556.]

gelium. Nam quod isti sacras scripturas, quasi mutas et inutiles, missas faciunt, et ad Deum potius ipsum in ecclesia, et in conciliis loquentem, hoc est, ad suos ipsorum sensus et sententias provocant: est ea ratio inveniendæ veritatis et admodum incerta, et valde periculosa, et quodammodo fanatica, et a sanctis patribus non approbata.

[Cap. 22. div.
4. v. p. 559.]

Chrysostomus quidem ait, Multos esse sæpe, qui jactent Spiritum Sanctum. At enim qui loquuntur de suo, falso se illum habere gloriantur. Quemadmodum enim, inquit,

⁵³ 2 Thess. ii.

⁵⁴ Rom. i. 16.

⁵⁵ Gal. i. 8.

Christus negabat se loqui a seipso, cum loqueretur ex lege et e prophetis: ita nunc si quid præter evangelium nomine Sancti Spiritus nobis obtrudatur, non est credendum. Ut enim Christus est impletio legis et prophetarum: ita Spiritus est impletio evangelii. Hæc Chrysostomus.

Isti vero quamvis non habeant sacras literas, habent tamen fortasse doctores veteres, et sanctos patres. Id enim semper magnifice jactaverunt, omnem antiquitatem, et perpetuum omnium temporum consensum a se facere: nostra vero omnia nova esse et recentia, ante paucos istos annos proximos nunquam audita. [PART. V.]
[Cap. i. div. i.
vol. vi. p. i.]

Certe in religionem Dei nihil gravius dici potest, quam si ea accusetur novitatis. Ut enim in Deo ipso, ita in ejus cultu nihil oportet esse novum. Nescimus tamen quo pacto ab initio rerum ita vidimus semper fieri, ut quotiescunque Deus quasi accenderet, et hominibus patefaceret veritatem suam, quamvis ea non tantum antiquissima, sed etiam æterna esset, tamen ab impiis hominibus et hostibus, recens et nova diceretur. Impius et sanguinarius vir Aman, ut Judæos in odium adduceret, sic eos apud regem Assuerum accusavit: Habes hic, inquit⁵⁶, rex, populum novis quibusdam utentem legibus, ad omnes autem tuas leges contumacem et rebellem. Paulus etiam Athenis⁵⁷ cum primum tradere cœpisset atque indicare evangelium, dictus est novorum deorum, hoc est, novæ religionis annunciator. Et an non possumus, inquiunt, ex te scire, quæ sit ista nova doctrina? Et Celsus, cum ex professo scriberet adversus Christum, ut ejus evangelium novitatis nomine per contemptum eluderet: An, inquit, post tot sæcula nunc tandem subiit Deum tam sera recordatio? Eusebius etiam⁵⁸ autor est, Christianam religionem ab initio contumeliæ causa dictam fuisse *νέαν καὶ ξένην*, hoc est, peregrinam et novam. Ita isti, nostra omnia, ut peregrina et nova, condemnant: sua autem omnia quæcunque ea sunt, laudari volunt ut antiquissima: ut hodie magi et malefici, quibus cum diis inferis res est, dicere solent se [Cap. i. div. 2.
vi. p. 12.]

⁵⁶ Esth. ii. 8, &c.⁵⁷ Act. xvii. 18, 19.⁵⁸ [Eccl. Hist. lib. i. cap. 4.]

[PART.V.]

habere libros suos, atque omnia sacra et recondita mysteria ab Athanasio, a Cypriano, a Mose, ab Abel, ab Adamo, atque etiam ab archangelo Raphaële, quo ars illa excelsior et divinatorum iudicetur, quæ ab huiusmodi patronis et inventoribus profecta sit. Ita isti, quo illa sua religio, quam ipsi sibi, idque non ita pridem pepererunt, vel stultis hominibus, vel parum quid agant quidque agatur cogitantibus, facilius et magis commendetur, eam solent dicere ad se ab Augustino, ab Hieronymo, a Chrysostomo, ab Ambrosio, ab apostolis, a Christo ipso pervenisse.

[Cap. 1. div. 3.
vi. p. 17.]

Satis enim sciunt, nihil istis nominibus popularius esse, aut in vulgus gratius. Verum, quid si ea, quæ isti nova videri volunt, inveniantur esse antiquissima? Rursus, quid si ea fere omnia, quæ isti antiquitatis nomine tantopere prædicant, ubi ea probe ac diligenter excussa fuerint, ad extremum inveniantur recentia et nova?

Profecto Judæorum leges, et cæremoniæ, quamvis eas Amanus accusaret novitatis, non poterant hominum cuiquam vere et recte cogitanti videri novæ. Erant enim antiquissimis tabulis consignatæ. Et Christus, quamvis cum multi putarent ab Abrahamo, et priscis patribus discessisse, et novam quandam religionem suo nomine invexisse; tamen vere respondit⁶²: Si crederetis Mosi, crederetis mihi quoque. Nam doctrina mea non est ita nova. Moses enim, antiquissimus autor, cui vos omnia tribuitis, de me locutus est. Et D. Paulus, evangelium Jesu Christi, etsi a multis novum esse iudicetur, tamen habet, inquit, antiquissimum testimonium legis et prophetarum. Nostra vero doctrina, quam rectius possumus Christi catholicam doctrinam appellare, ita non est nova, ut eam nobis Antiquus dierum Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, monumentis vetustissimis in evangelio, et in prophetarum atque apostolorum libris commendarit: eaque nunc nova nemini videri possit, nisi si cui aut prophetarum fides, aut evangelium, aut Christus ipse videatur novus. Istorum vero religio, si ita antiqua et vetus est, uti eam ipsi videri

[Cap. 2. div. 1
et 2. vi. p. 18.]

volunt, cur eam ab exemplis primitivæ ecclesiæ, ex antiquis patribus et conciliis veteribus non probant? Cur tam vetus causa tandiu deserta jacet sine patrono? Ferrum quidem et flammam semper habuerunt ad manum: de conciliis vero antiquis, et patribus, magnum silentium. Atqui absurdum erat ab istis ita cruentis et feris rationibus incipere, si potuissent alia argumenta leviora et mitiora inveniri. Quod si illi ita prorsus fidunt vetustati, et nihil simulant, cur ante non ita multos annos, Joannes Clement Anglus, aliquot folia vetustissimi patris et Græci Episcopi Theodoreti, in quibus ille perspicue ac luculenter docebat, naturam panis in eucharistia non aboleri, cum putaret nullum aliud exemplar posse uspiam inveniri, inspectantibus aliquot bonis viris, et fide dignis, laceravit et abjecit in focum? Cur negat Albertus Pighius, veterem patrem Augustinum recte sensisse de peccato originis ^[Cap. 2. div. 3. vi. p. 19.] ⁶³? aut de matrimonio ⁶⁴, quod post votum nuncupatum sit initum, (quod Augustinus asserit esse matrimonium, nec posse rescindi,) illum errare, et falsum esse dicit, nec proba uti dialectica? Cur nuper cum excuderent veterem patrem Origenem ^[Cap. 2. div. 4. vi. p. 23.] ⁶⁵ in Evangelium Joannis, sextum illud caput, ubi illum credibile, vel potius certum est, contra ipsos de eucharistia multa tradidisse, integrum omiserunt: et librum mutilum potius quam integrum, qui errores suos coarqueret, dare maluerunt? An hoc est antiquitati confidere, antiquorum patrum scripta lacerare, suppressere, truncare, comburere? Operæ pretium est videre, quam pulchre isti cum illis patribus, quos jactare solent esse suos, de religione conveniant. Vetus concilium Eliberitanum [*al.* Eliberinum] decrevit ⁶⁶, ne quid quod colitur a populo pingeretur in templis. Vetus pater Epiphanius ait, esse horrendum nefas, et non ferendum flagitium, si quis vel pictam, quamvis Christi ipsius, imaginem excitet in templis Christianorum. Isti imaginibus et statuīs, quasi sine illis religio nulla sit, omnia templa sua, atque omnes angulos compleverunt. Veteres ^[Cap. 3. div. 3. vi. p. 29.] ^[Cap. 3. div. 4. vi. p. 33.]

⁶³ Dist. 27. Quidam. August. de Bono Viduitat. cap. 10.

⁶⁴ Caus. 27. c. 4. nuptiarum bonum. In Controversiis.

⁶⁵ Liber hodie extat et circumfertur mutilus.

⁶⁶ Cap. 3.

[PART. V.]

patres, Origenes et Chrysostomus⁶⁷, hortantur populum ad lectionem sacrarum literarum, ut libros coemant, ut de rebus sacris inter se, uxores cum viris, parentes cum liberis domi disputent: isti scripturas condemnant tanquam mortua elementa, et ab illis quantum maxime possunt, arcent populum. Veteres patres Cyprianus, Epiphanius, Hieronymus⁶⁸, si quis forte voverit se velle vivere vitam cœlibem, et postea vivat impure, nec possit incendia cupiditatum cohibere: satius esse dicunt, ut ducat uxorem, et sese caste gerat in matrimonio: atque illud ipsum matrimonium vetus pater Augustinus ratum et firmum esse judicat, nec oportere revocari: isti eum, qui se voto semel obstrinxerit, quantumvis uratur postea, quantumvis scortetur, quantumvis flagitiose et perditè contaminetur, tamen illum non sinunt uxorem ducere: aut si forte duxerit, tamen negant illud esse matrimonium: et satius multo ac sanctius esse docent, concubinam aut scortum alere, quam ita vivere. Augustinus vetus pater querebatur de multitudine inanum cæremoniarum, quibus jam tum videbat hominum animos et conscientias opprimi⁶⁹: isti, quasi aliud nihil Deo curæ sit, ita cæremonias auxerunt in immensum, ut nihil jam pene aliud in illorum templis, et sacris relictum sit. Vetus pater Augustinus negat⁷⁰ fas esse, monachum ignavum in otio degere; et specie ac simulatione sanctitatis, ex alieno vivere: et illum qui ita vivat, vetus pater Apollonius ait, latroni esse similem. Isti monachorum habent, armentane, dicam, an greges, qui cum prorsus nihil agant, et ne simulent quidem, aut præ se gerant speciem ullam sanctitatis, tamen non tantum vivunt, sed etiam luxuriuntur ex alieno. Vetus concilium Romanum decrevit⁷¹, ne quis intersit sacris quæ dicantur ab illo sacerdote, quem certum sit alere concubinam: isti et concubinas locant mercede sacerdotibus suis, et ad illorum sacrilegia homines invitos per vim adigunt. Veteres

[Cap. 3. div. 5. vi. p. 38.]

[Cap. 3. div. 6. vi. p. 44.]

[Cap. 3. div. 7. vi. p. 46.]

⁶⁷ Origenes in Levit. c. 16. Chrysos. in Matt. hom. 2. Idem in Joan. hom. 31.

⁶⁸ Cyprian, Epist. ii. lib. 1. Epiphani. contra Apostolicos Hære. 61.

Hieron. ad Demetriadem.

⁶⁹ Ad Januarium.

⁷⁰ De opere monachorum.

⁷¹ Can. 8.

Canones Apostolorum⁷³, illum episcopum, qui simul et civilem magistratum, et ecclesiasticam functionem obire velit, jubent ab officio summo: isti utrumque magistratum et obeunt, et obire omnino volunt; vel potius alterum, quem ab illis maxime obiri oportuit, non attingunt: nemo tamen est qui illos jubeat summo. Vetus concilium Gangrense jubet, ne quis ita distinguat sacerdotem cœlibem a marito, ut cœlibatus causa alterum putet altero sanctiorem: isti eos ita distinguunt, ut a pio et probro viro qui uxorem duxerit, omnia sua sacra statim putent profanari. Vetus imperator, Justinianus⁷⁴, jussit in sacro ministerio omnia clara, et quam maxime arguta et expressa voce pronuntiari, ut fructus ex ea re aliquis ad populum redire posset: isti ne quid populus intelligat, omnia sua non tantum obscura et submissa voce, sed etiam aliena, et barbara lingua mussitant. Vetus concilium⁷⁵ Carthaginense jubet, ne quid in sacro cœtu legatur præter scripturas canonicas: isti ea legunt in templis suis, quæ ne ipsi quidem dubitant esse mera mendacia, et inanes fabulas. Quod si quis ista infirma putat esse, ac levia, quod ab imperatoribus et minutis quibusdam episcopis, et non ita plenius conciliis decreta fuerint, et papæ magis autoritate ac nomine delectatur; Julius papa diserte vetat⁷⁶, ne sacerdos, dum peragit sacra mysteria, panem immergat in calicem: isti contra decretum Julii papæ, panem dividunt et immergunt. Clemens papa negat fas esse episcopo gerere utrumque gladium; et si utrumque, inquit, habere vis, et te ipsum decipies, et eos qui te audient. Jam papa gladium utrumque sibi vindicat, et utrumque gerit: quare minus mirum videri debet, si illud secutum sit, quod Clemens ait, ut ille et seipsum deceperit, et illos qui eum audierint. Leo papa in uno templo unam tantum ait fas esse missam dicere uno die: isti in uno templo quotidie, sæpe denas, sæpe vicenas, sæpe tricenas, sæpe etiam plures missas dicunt; ut miser spectator vix scire possit, quo se potissimum debeat vertere. Gelasius papa, si quis dividat eucharistiam, et cum

[Cap. 3. div. 8. vi. p. 48.]

[Cap. 3. div. 9. vi. p. 60.]

[Cap. 3. div. 10. vi. p. 68.]

[Cap. 4. div. 1. vi. p. 71.]

[Cap. 4. div. 2. vi. p. 75.]

[Cap. 4. div. 3. vi. p. 77.]

⁷³ Can. 80.⁷⁴ In Novellis Const. 123. 145.⁷⁵ Tertium Carth. cap. 47.⁷⁶ De Cons. dist. 2. Cum enim nemo. [I. Cum omne.]

[PART. V.]

alteram partem suscipiat, abstineat ab altera, eum ait improbe facere, et sacrilegium committere: isti contra verbum Dei, contraque Gelasium papam, alteram tantum partem eucharistiæ populo dari jubent; et in ea re, sacerdotes suos alligant sacrilegio.

[Cap. 5. div. 1. vi. p. 79.]

Quod si illi hæc omnia usu jam ipso antiquata esse dicent, et mortua, et nihil ad ista tempora pertinere: tamen ut omnes intelligant, quæ fides istis hominibus habenda sit, quaque spe concilia ab illis convocentur; videamus paucis, quam probe curent ea, quæ proximis istis annis, recenti adhuc memoria in publico concilio legitime indicto, ipsi sancte observanda esse decreverunt. In concilio proximo Tridentino, vix ante annos quatuordecim, sancitum est communibus suffragiis omnium ordinum, ne cui uni committerentur duo sacerdotia uno tempore. Ubi nunc est illa sanctio? An ea quoque tam cito antiquata est et mortua? Nam isti quidem non tantum duo sacerdotia, sed etiam complura sæpe monasteria, et episcopatus modobinos, modo ternos, modo quaternos uni tribuunt; eique non tantum indocto, sed etiam sæpe homini militari. In eodem concilio decretum est, oportere omnes episcopos docere evangelium: isti neque docent, neque in pulpitem unquam ascendunt, neque id putant quidquam ad munus suum pertinere. Quæ ergo est ista pompa vetustatis? Quid de priscorum patrum, quid de conciliorum novorum veterumque nominibus glorientur? Quid videri volunt niti autoritate illorum, quos, cum visum est, pro libidine contemnunt?

[Cap. 5. div. 2. vi. p. 80.]

[Cap. 6. div. 1. ibid.]

Sed gestit animus cum pontifice potius ipso agere, et hæc illi coram in os dicere. Dic ergo nobis⁷⁷, pie pontifex, qui omnia antiqua crepas, et omnes tibi uni addictos esse gloriaris; ex omnibus patribus quis unquam te vel summum pontificem, vel universalem episcopum, vel caput ecclesiæ appellavit? Quis tibi traditum esse dixit utrumque gladium? Quis te habere auctoritatem et jus convocandi

[Div. 2. vi. p. 84.]

[Div. 3. p. 86.]

⁷⁷ De Major. et Obed. Unam sanctam. In extrav. Bonifacii VIII. Durandus. Concil. Lat. sub Julio II. Dis. 9. Innocen. De Major. et

Obed. soli. In extravag. Joan. 22. c. Cum inter nonnullos. In glossa finali. In edit. impressa Parisiis, 1503.

concilia? Quis universum mundum esse diœcesim tuam? [PART.V.]
 Quis de tua plenitudine episcopos omnes accipere? Quis [Cap. 6. div. 4. vi. p. 88.]
 tibi datam esse omnem potestatem tam in cœlo, quam in [Div. 5. p. 91.]
 terra? Quis te nec a regibus, nec a toto clero, nec ab uni- [Div. 6. p. 92.]
 verso populo posse judicari? Quis reges et imperatores, de [Div. 7. p. 98.]
 jussu et voluntate Christi, a te accipere potestatem? Quis [Div. 8. p. 101.]
 te ita exquisita, et mathematica ratione, septuagies septies [Div. 9. p. 104.]
 majorem esse maximis regibus? Quis tibi potestatem am- [Div. 10. p. 106.]
 pliorem tributam esse, quam reliquis patriarchis? Quis te [Div. 11. p. 113.]
 Dominum Deum esse, aut non purum hominem, aut quid- [Div. 12. p. 116.]
 dam coagmentatum et concretum ex Deo et homine? Quis [Div. 13. p. 117.]
 te unum fontem esse omnis juris? Quis te imperium [Div. 14. p. 118.]
 habere in purgatorium? Quis te pro tuo arbitrio imperare [Div. 15. p. 120.]
 posse angelis Dei? Quis te esse regem regum et dominum [Div. 16. p. 120.]
 dominantium unquam dixit? Possumus alia quoque eodem [Cap. 7. div. 1. vi. p. 123.]
 modo. Ex omni numero veterum episcoporum et patrum,
 quis unquam unus te docuit, vel inspectante populo, missam
 privatam dicere, vel eucharistiam supra caput attollere,
 qua in re omnis nunc religio tua continetur: vel Christi
 sacramenta truncare, et contra ejus institutum, atque ex-
 pressa verba, altera parte populum fraudare? Utque semel
 finem faciamus, ex omnibus patribus, quis unus te docuit,
 Christi sanguinem, et sanctorum martyrum merita dispen-
 sare, et indulgentias tuas, atque omnia spatia purgatorii,
 ceu merces in foro vendere?

Soliti sunt isti sæpe reconditam quandam doctrinam [Cap. 8. div. 1. vi. p. 130.]
 suam, et multiplices variasque lectiones prædicare. Pro-
 ferant ergo nunc aliquid si possunt, ut aliquid saltem legisse
 ac scire videantur.

Clamarunt sæpe fortiter in omnibus circulis, omnes
 partes religionis suæ antiquas esse, et non tantum multi-
 tudine, sed etiam consensu et continuatione omnium na-
 tionum et temporum approbatas. Ostendant ergo aliquando
 antiquitatem istam suam: faciant, ut appareat ista, quæ
 tantopere prædicant, esse tam late propagata. Doceant
 omnes nationes Christianas in suam istam religionem con-
 cessisse. Sed fugiunt, ut jam ante diximus, a decretis ipsi

[PART.V.]

suis : eaque quæ ante ita paucos annos ab ipsis in omnem æternitatem sancita erant, tam brevi tempore resciderunt. Quid ergo illis fidendum est in patribus, in veteribus conciliis, in verbis Dei? Non habent, O Deus bone, non habent ea, quæ se habere gloriantur; non antiquitatem, non universalitatem, non locorum, non temporum omnium consensum. Idque ipsi, etsi dissimulatum potius cuperent, tamen non ignorant: immo etiam interdum non obscure confitentur. Itaque veterum conciliorum, et patrum sanctiones, aiunt ejusmodi esse, ut interdum mutari possint: aliis enim temporibus ecclesiæ, alia atque alia decreta convenire. Atque ita sese abdunt sub nomine ecclesiæ, et inani fuco miseris mortalibus illudunt. Et mirum est, aut ita cæcos esse homines ut ista videre non possint: aut si videant, ita esse patientes, ut ea tam facile, tamque æquo animo possint ferre.

[Cap. 9. div. 1.
vi. p. 132.]

Sed cum illa tanquam nimium jam vetera et obsoleta, juberent esse irrita: alia quædam fortasse meliora, atque utiliora, reposuerunt. Solent enim dicere, ne Christum quidem ipsum, aut apostolum, si reviviscant, melius, aut sanctius administrare posse ecclesiam Dei, quam quomodo nunc administratur ab ipsis. Reposuerunt illi quidem alia: sed, quemadmodum Hieremias ait, paleam pro tritico: eaque, ut ait Esaias, quæ Deus ab illis non requisivit. Obturarunt omnes venas aquæ vivæ, et exciderunt populo Dei cisternas ruinosas, et lutulentas, plenas limo et sordibus, quæ nec habent aquam puram, nec eam poterant continere. Eripuerunt populo sacram communionem: verbum Dei, unde omnis consolatio petenda erat: verum cultum Numinis: rectum usum sacramentorum et precum: dederunt autem nobis de suo, quibus nos interim oblectaremus, sales, aquas, ampullas, sputa, ramusculos, bullas, jubilæa, indulgentias, cruces, suffitus, et infinitum numerum cæremoni-

[Cap. 9. div. 2.
vi. p. 140.]

arum, et ludos, ut Plautus ait, ludificabiles. In his illi rebus omnem religionem collocarunt: his rebus docuerunt Deum rite placari posse: his abigi dæmones: his confirmari hominum conscientias. Hæc videlicet, sunt pigmenta, et myrothecia religionis Christianæ. Hæc Deo videnti, grata et accepta sunt: hæc oportuit in honorem venire, ut

[Cap. 10. div.
1. vi. p. 142.]

Christi et apostolorum instituta tollerentur. Atque, ut olim rex impius Hieroboam, cum cultum Dei sustulisset, et populum ad aureos vitulos adduxisset, ne forte postea mutarent voluntatem, et a se dilaberentur, et redirent Hierosolymam ad templum Dei, eos longa oratione cohortatus est ad constantiam: Hi, inquit, Israel, sunt Dii tui: hoc pacto Deus vester jussit se a vobis coli: grave autem vobis, et molestum erit iter tam longinquum suscipere, et quotannis ad salutandum et colendum Deum ascendere Hierosolymam. Ita prorsus isti, cum semel traditionum suarum causa irritam fecissent legem Dei, ne populus postea oculos aperiret, et alio dilaberetur, atque aliunde peteret certiore aliquam rationem salutis suæ; O quoties acclamarunt hunc esse illum cultum, qui Deo placeat, quemque ille a nobis exigat, quoque iratus flecti velit! his rebus ecclesiæ consensum contineri: his rebus omnia peccata expiari, et tranquillari conscientias: qui discesserit ab his, eum sibi nihil spei ad æternam salutem reliquisse! Grave autem ac molestum populo esse, ad Christum, ad apostolos, ad veteres patres respicere, quidque illi velint aut jubeant, perpetuo attendere! Hoc, videlicet, est populum Dei ab infirmis mundi elementis, a fermento scribarum et Phariseorum, et ab humanis traditionibus abducere! Christi atque apostolorum jussa loco moveri oportuit, ut ista succederent! O justam causam, cur vetus et multis sæculis probata doctrina antiquaretur, et in ecclesiam Dei nova forma religionis inveheretur! Tamen quicquid est, clamant isti, nihil oportere immutari: his rebus hominum animis satisfieri: Romanam ecclesiam ista decrevisse: eam errare non posse. Sylvester enim Prie-
[Cap. 10. div. 2. vi. p. 144.]
rias ait, ecclesiam Romanam esse normam et regulam veritatis: sacras scripturas ab illa, et auctoritatem, et fidem accipere. Doctrina, inquit, Romanæ ecclesiæ, est regula fidei infallibilis, a qua sacra scriptura robur accipit. Et indulgentiæ, inquit, auctoritate scripturæ non innotuerunt nobis, sed innotuerunt auctoritate Romanæ ecclesiæ Romanorumque pontificum, quæ major est. Pighius etiam non dubitat dicere, injussu Romanæ ecclesiæ ne clarissimæ quidem scripturæ credendum esse. Prorsus, ut siquis

[PART. V.]

istorum, qui Latine recte ac pure loqui non possit, aliquid tamen in ea lingua pro forensi consuetudine celeriter et expedite balbutiat, omnino dicat ad eum nunc modum aliis etiam omnibus loquendum esse, quo ante multos annos Mammetrectus aut Catholicon locuti sint, quoque adhuc ipsi utantur in foro: sic enim satis intelligi posse, quid dicatur, et hominum voluntati satisfieri: ridiculum autem esse, nunc tandem novo dicendi genere turbare orbem terrarum, et Ciceronis ac Cæsaris veterem in dicendo puritatem atque eloquentiam, revocare.

Tantum, scilicet, isti debent inscitiae ac tenebris superiorum temporum. Multa, ut ait quidam⁷⁸, habentur sæpe in pretio, tantum quod dicata aliquando fuerint Deorum templis. Ita nos videmus multa hodie probari ab istis, et magni fieri, non quod ea tanti esse judicent, sed tantum quod recepta fuerint consuetudine, et quodammodo dicata templo Dei.

[Cap. 11. div.
1. vi. p. 152.]

At ecclesia, inquit, nostra errare non potest. Id, opinor, ita dicunt, ut olim Lacedæmonii solebant dicere, in tota sua republica nullum posse inveniri adulterum, cum revera omnes potius essent adulteri, et incertis nuptiis et uxoribus inter se communibus uterentur: aut ut hodie canonistæ⁷⁹ ventris causa solent de papa dicere: illum, cum sit dominus omnium beneficiorum, etsi pretio vendat episcopatus, monasteria, sacerdotia, et nihil a se gratis abire sinat; tamen, cum ea omnia dicat esse sua, etiamsi maxime velit, non posse committere simoniam⁸⁰. Quam autem id firmum sit, quamque consentanee rationi dicatur, nos adhuc videre non possumus; nisi forte, ut olim veteres Romani victoriæ, ita isti veritati, postquam ea semel ad illos pervenisset, alas quibus advolaverat detraxerint, ne

[Cap. 11. div.
2. vi. p. 160.]

posset in posterum avolare. Sed quid si illis Hieremias dicat, ut supra commemoravimus, Hæc esse verba mendacii? Quid si idem rursus dicat, Illos ipsos, quos vinitores esse oportuit, dissipasse ac perdidisse vineam Domini? Quid si Christus dicat: Illos quibus maxime

⁷⁸ Plinius. ⁷⁹ Summa Angelica, in dictione papæ.
ricus de Schismat.

⁸⁰ Theodo-

templum oportuit esse curæ, ex templo Domini fecisse speluncam latronum? Quod si errare ecclesia Romana non potest, felicitatem ejus oportet majorem esse, quam istorum prudentiam. Ea enim est illorum vita, doctrina, diligentia, ut per eos quidem non tantum errare ecclesia, sed etiam funditus interire, et extinguì possit. Profecto si errare ecclesia ea potest, quæ a verbo Dei, quæ a jussis Christi, quæ ab apostolorum institutis, quæ a primitivæ ecclesiæ exemplis, quæ a veterum patrum et conciliorum sanctionibus, quæ a suis ipsius decretis discesserit, quæ nullis, nec veteribus nec novis, nec suis nec alienis, nec humanis nec divinis legibus teneri velit: certum est ecclesiam Romanam non tantum potuisse errare, sed etiam flagitiose et turpiter erravisse.

[Cap. 12, div.
1. vi. p. 161.]

At de nostris, inquit, fuistis: nunc autem apostatæ facti estis, et a nobis discessistis. Discessimus quidem ab illis, et ea de re, et Deo Opt. Maximo gratias agimus, et nobis magnopere gratulamur. At a primitiva ecclesia, ab apostolis, a Christo non discessimus. Educati quidem sumus apud istos in tenebris et ignorance Dei, ut Moses in disciplinis, et in sinu Ægyptiorum: De vestris fuimus, inquit Tertullianus, fateor, nec mirum: Fiunt enim, inquit, non nascuntur Christiani. Sed cur ipsi de suis illis septem montibus, in quibus olim Roma stetit, descenderunt, ut in planitie potius, in Campo Martio habitarent? Dicerent fortasse, quod jam aquarum ductus, sine quibus non possent commode vivere, in illis montibus defecissent. Dent isti sane eam nobis veniam de aqua æternæ vitæ, quam volunt sibi dari de aqua puteali. Aqua jam apud istos defecerat: Seniores, ut Hieremias ait, mittebant parvulos suos ad aquas: at illi, cum nihil invenirent, miseri et siti perditì retulerunt vasa inania. Egeni, inquit Esaias, et pauperes quærebant aquas, sed eas nullas uspiam invenerunt. Lingua illorum siti jam aruerat. Isti omnes canales, et ductus perfregerant: isti obstruxerant omnes venas, et cœno lutoque oppleverant fontem aquæ vivæ: utque olim Caligula, occlusis omnibus horreis, publicam populo inedia et famem: ita illi, obturatis omnibus fontibus verbi Dei,

[Cap. 12, div.
2. vi. p. 162.]

[Cap. 13, div.
1. vi. p. 174.]

[PART. V.]

sitim populo miserabilem induxerant. Illi hominibus famem, ut ait Amos propheta⁸³, sitimque attulerant: non famem panis: non sitim aquæ: sed audiendi verba Dei. Circumbant miseri quærentes scintillam aliquam divinæ lucis, ad quam exhilararent conscientias: at ea jam prorsus extincta erat: nihil potuerunt invenire.—Hæc erat conditio, hæc erat miserabilis forma ecclesiæ Dei. Misere in ea sine evangelio, sine luce, sine consolatione ulla vivebatur.

[Cap. 13. div. 2. vi. p. 176.]

[Cap. 14. div. 1. vi. p. 178.]

Quare etsi discessio illis nostra molesta est, tamen cogitare debent quam justa fuerit causa discessionis. Nam si dicent, ab ea societate in qua fueris educatus, nullo modo fas esse discedere: facile possunt in nostro capite et prophetas, et apostolos, et Christum ipsum condemnare. Nam cur hoc etiam non queruntur, Lothum e Sodoma; Abramum e Chahlæa; Hebræos ex Ægypto; Christum a Judæis; Paulum a Pharisæis discessisse? Nisi enim justa aliqua possit esse causa discessionis, nihil videmus, cur non illi quoque possint eodem modo factionis et seditionis accusari.

[Cap. 14. div. 2. vi. p. 179.]

[Cap. 14. div. 3. vi. p. 180.]

[Cap. 15. div. 1. vi. p. 183.]

Quod si nos damnandi sumus pro hæreticis, qui istorum imperata omnia non facimus; quid illi qui tandem, aut quales videri debent, qui Christi et apostolorum imperata contemnunt? Si nos sumus schismatici, qui discessimus ab istis; quo tandem illos nomine appellabimus, qui a Græcis, a quibus fidem acceperunt, ab ecclesia primitiva, a Christo ipso, ab apostolis, tanquam a parentibus discesserunt? Nam Græci quidem, qui hodie profitentur religionem et nomen Christi, etsi multa habeant contaminata, magnam tamen adhuc partem retinent eorum quæ acceperant ab apostolis. Itaque nec privatas habent missas, nec truncata sacramenta, nec purgatoria, nec indulgentias. Pontificios vero titulos, et magnifica nomina tanti faciunt, ut quicumque eos imponat sibi, seque vel universalem episcopum, vel ecclesiæ totius caput velit appellari, eum illi non dubitent, et superbum hominem, et in omnes alios episcopos fratres suos contumeliosum, et hæreticum esse dicere.

Jam vero cum perspicuum sit, et negari non possit, istos ab illis a quibus evangelium, a quibus fidem, a quibus religionem, a quibus ecclesiam acceperunt, defecisse: quid causæ est, cur nunc ad eosdem, tanquam ad fontes, nolint revocari? Cur quasi apostoli omnes, patresque nihil viderint, ita illorum temporum similitudinem reformidant? An enim isti plus vident, aut ecclesiam Dei pluris faciunt, quam illi, qui ista tradiderunt? Nam nos quidem discessimus ab illa ecclesia, in qua nec verbum Dei pure audiri potuit, nec sacramenta administrari, nec Dei nomen, ut oportuit, invocari: quam ipsi fatentur multis in rebus esse vitiosam: in qua nihil erat, quod quenquam posset prudentem hominem, et de sua salute cogitantem, retinere. Postremo, ab ecclesia ea discessimus, quæ nunc est, non quæ olim fuit: atque ita discessimus, ut Daniel e cavea leonum, ut tres illi pueri ex incendio: nec tam discessimus, quam ab istis diris et devotionibus ejecti sumus.

[Cap. 15, div. 2. vi. p. 190.]

[Cap. 15, div. 3. vi. p. 191.]

[Cap. 15, div. 4. vi. p. 192.]

Accessimus vero ad illam Ecclesiam, in qua ne ipsi quidem, si vere atque ex animo loqui volunt, negare possunt omnia caste ac reverenter, et quantum nos maxime assequi potuimus, proxime ad priscorum temporum rationem administrari. Conferant enim ecclesias nostras suasque inter se: videbunt et se turpissime ab apostolis, et nos ab ipsis justissime discessisse.—Nos enim cum Christo, apostolis, et sanctis patribus eucharistiam populo damus integram: isti, contra omnes patres, contra omnes apostolos, contra Christum ipsum, cum summo, ut Gelasius ait, sacrilegio, sacramenta dividunt, et alteram partem populo eripiunt.

[Cap. 15, div. 5. vi. p. 193.]

[Cap. 16, div. 1. vi. p. 194.]

Nos cœnam Dominicam ad Christi institutionem revocavimus, eamque quam maxime, quamque plurimis communem, utque appellatur, ita re ipsa communionem esse volumus. Isti contra institutum Christi omnia immutarunt, et ex sacra communione privatam fecerunt missam: atque ita nos cœnam præbemus populo, isti inane spectaculum.

Nos cum antiquissimis patribus affirmamus, corpus Christi non comedi nisi ab hominibus piis et fidelibus, et imbutis Spiritu Christi: isti docent ipsissimum corpus Christi re ipsa, utque ipsi loquuntur, “realiter,” et

[PART. V.]

“substantialiter,” non tantum ab impiis et infidelibus, sed etiam, quod horrendum dictu est, a muribus et canibus posse comedi.

Nos ita precamur in templis, ut, quemadmodum Paulus monet⁸⁴, populus scire possit quid precemur, et communibus votis respondere Amen: isti ut æ tinniens, voces in templis ignotas et peregrinas, sine intelligentia, sine sensu, sine mente fundunt: et omnino id agunt, ne populus quidquam possit intelligere.

[Cap. 16. div. 2. vi. p. 202.]

Et ne omnia discrimina commemoremus, (sunt enim prope infinita) nos scripturas sacras convertimus in omnes

[Ibid. div. 3. vi. p. 204.]

linguas: isti eas vix exstare patiuntur in ulla lingua. Nos invitamus populum ad legendum, et audiendum verbum

[Ibid. div. 4. vi. p. 206.]

Dei: isti abigunt. Nos causam ab omnibus cognosci volumus: isti fugiunt iudicium. Nos scientia nitimur: isti

[Ibid. div. 5. vi. p. 207.]

inscitia. Nos luci fidimus: isti tenebris. Nos colimus, ut par est, voces apostolorum et prophetarum: isti comburunt.

[Ibid. div. 6 et 7. vi. p. 208.]

Postremo, nos in Dei causa, Dei unius iudicio stare volumus: isti stare volunt suo. Quod si illi hæc omnia tranquillo animo, et ad audiendum, discendumque comparato spectare velint: non tantum probabunt institutum nostrum, qui relictis erroribus, Christum, ejusque apostolos secuti sumus; sed ipsi etiam a se deficient, seque ultro aggregabunt ad partes nostras.

[Ibid. div. 8. vi. p. 209.]

[PART. VI.]

[Cap. 1. div. 1. vi. p. 210.]

Atqui sine sacro œcumenico concilio nefas, inquit, fuit ista tentare: ibi enim esse omnem vim ecclesiæ: ibi Christum pollicitum esse sese semper præsto adfuturum.—

Atqui ipsi mandata Dei et apostolorum decreta violarunt, utque jam diximus, omnia prope, non tantum instituta, sed etiam dogmata primitivæ ecclesiæ dissipaverunt, nihil expectato sacro concilio.

Verum quod aiunt, nihil cuiquam fas esse innovare sine concilio: quis tandem scripsit nobis istas leges? Aut unde isti hoc edictum habuerunt?

[Cap. 1. div. 2. vi. p. 211.]

Ridicule quidem fecit ille rex⁸⁵, qui cum oraculo certus esset de sententia et voluntate summi Jovis, postea rem integram retulit ad Apollinem; ut sciret an idem illi vide-

⁸⁴ 1 Cor. xiv. 16.⁸⁵ Agesilaus.

retur quod patri. Nos autem multo ineptius faceremus, si, cum Deum ipsum nobis in sacrosanctis scripturis aperte loquentem audiamus, ejusque voluntatem et mentem intelligamus, postea, quasi id nihil sit, rem integram referre velimus ad concilium: quod non aliud est, quam quærere, an idem hominibus videatur quod Deo: et an homines velint mandata Dei autoritate sua comprobare. Quid enim? nisi concilium velit et jubeat, verum non erit verum? aut Deus non erit Deus? Si Christus ab initio ita facere voluisset, ut nihil doceret, aut diceret invitis episcopis: omnem autem doctrinam suam ad Annam et Caiapham retulisset; ubi nunc esset fides Christiana? aut quis unquam audisset evangelium? Petrus quidem (quem pontifex sæpius, magisque prædicare solet, quam Jesum Christum) fidenter restitit sacro concilio: et satius, inquit⁸⁶, est obtemperare Deo, quam hominibus. Et Paulus⁸⁷, cum semel animo hausisset evangelium, idque non ab hominibus neque per hominem, sed per solam voluntatem Dei; non deliberavit cum carne et sanguine, nec retulit ad cognatos aut fratres suos, sed statim abiit in Arabiam, ut divina mysteria, Deo autore, publicaret.

Nos quidem concilia, et episcoporum doctorumque hominum conventus et colloquia non contemnimus. Neque ea quæ fecimus, prorsus sine episcopis aut sine concilio fecimus. Plenis comitiis res acta est, longa deliberatione, frèquenti synodo. De isto vero concilio, quod nunc a Pio pontifice simulatur, in quo homines non appellati, non auditi, non visi, ita facile condemnantur; quid nobis expectandum aut sperandum sit, non est difficile divinare.

Nazianzenus olim, cum suo tempore videret homines in hujusmodi conventibus ita esse cæcos et obstinatos, ut abducerentur affectibus, et victoriam magis quærerent, quam veritatem, diserte pronuntiavit, se nullius concilii unquam exitum vidisse bonum. Quid ille nunc diceret, si hodie viveret, et istorum conatus intelligeret? Nam tum quidem, etsi studebatur partibus; tamen causæ cognoscebantur, et errores manifesti omnium partium suffragiis

⁸⁶ Act. iv. 19.⁸⁷ Ad Gal. i. 12. 16, 17.

[PART.
VI.]

communibus tollebantur. Isti vero nec causam disceptari libere volunt, nec, quantumcunque sit errorum, quidquam patiuntur immutari.

Id enim illi sæpe, et sine fronte jactare solent, ecclesiam suam errare non posse: nihil esse in ea vitii, nihil esse nobis concedendum. Aut, si quid sit, tamen episcoporum et abbatum esse hoc iudicium: illos esse moderatores rerum: illos esse ecclesiam Dei. Aristoteles ait, Spurius non posse facere civitatem: an autem ex istis effici possit ecclesia Dei, ipsi videant. Certe nec legitimi sunt abbates, nec genuini episcopi.

[Cap. 3. div. 3.
vi. p. 225.]

Sed sint sane ecclesia; audiantur in conciliis; soli habeant jus suffragandi. Olim tamen cum ecclesia Dei, si ad istorum quidem ecclesiam conferatur, satis commode regeretur, ut Cyprianus ait, advocabantur ad ecclesiasticarum causarum cognitionem et presbyteri et diaconi, et nonnulla etiam pars plebis.

[Cap. 3. div. 4.
vi. p. 232.]

Sed quid si isti abbates et episcopi nihil sciant? Quid si, quid sit religio, quidque de Deo sentiendum sit, non intelligant? Quid si lex perierit a sacerdote, et consilium a senioribus? Quid si, ut ait Micheas⁸⁹, nox illis sit provisione, et tenebræ pro divinatione? Quid si, ut Esaias ait⁹⁰, omnes speculatores civitatis facti sunt cæci? Quid si sal vim suam et saporem amiserit? utque Christus ait⁹¹, ad nullum usum sit accommodus [*l. accommodum*], ne ad id quidem ut abjiciatur in sterquilinum?

[Cap. 4. div. 1.
vi. p. 233.]

Ad papam scilicet omnia deferent, qui errare non potest. At illud primum ineptum est, Spiritum Sanctum a sacro concilio curriculo avolare Romam; ut si quid dubitet aut hæreat, et sese explicare non possit, ab alio nescio quo spiritu doctiore consilium capiat. Nam, si ita est, quid opus erat tot episcopos tantis impensis, tam longinquis itineribus, Tridentum hoc tempore convocari? Consultius multo erat et satius, certe multo et brevius et commodius, ut ad papam potius omnia rejicerent, et statim ad illius sacri pectoris oraculum devenirent. Deinde etiam iniquum est, causam nostram a tot episcopis et abbatibus, ad unius

⁸⁹ Mich. iii. 6.

⁹⁰ Esai. lvi. 10.

⁹¹ Matt. v. 13.

[PART.
VI.]

hominis iudicium devolvere; ejus præsertim, qui a nobis gravissimis criminibus accusetur, nec adhuc causam suam dixerit, et nos, antequam vocaremur ad iudicium, sine iudicio condemnarit. An ergo nos ista fingimus? aut ista hodie non est ratio conciliorum? Aut non omnia a sacro concilio ad unum pontificem deferuntur: ut, quasi tot sententiis, et subscriptionibus nihil sit actum, ille unus possit addere, mutare, minuere, abrogare, approbare, relaxare, restringere quicquid velit? Quorum ergo hominum sunt hæc verba? cur episcopi et abbates, non ita pridem in proximo concilio Tridentino, ita ad extremum decreverunt: "Salva semper in omnibus sedis apostolicæ autoritate?" Aut cur Paschalis papa ita insolenter de se scribit? Quasi, inquit, Romanæ ecclesiæ legem concilia ulla præfixerint ⁹²: cum omnia concilia per Romanæ ecclesiæ auctoritatem et facta sint, et robur acceperint, et in illorum statutis Romani pontificis patenter excipiatur auctoritas? Si ista rata esse volunt, cur concilia indicuntur? sin ea jubent esse irrita, cur in istorum libris, quasi integra relinquuntur?

Sed sit sane pontifex unus supra omnia concilia, hoc est, sit pars aliqua major quam totum: plus possit, plus sapiat, quam omnes sui: et vel invito Hieronymo ⁹³, sit urbis unius auctoritas major quam orbis terrarum. At quid si ille de his rebus nihil viderit; et nec sacras scripturas, nec veteres patres, nec concilia sua unquam legerit? Quid si ille, ut olim papa Liberius ⁹⁴, deficiat ad Arianos: aut, ut non ante ita multos annos, Joannes papa, de futura vita, et animarum immortalitate impie et nefarie sentiat: aut, ut olim papa Zosimus concilium Nicænum, ita ille nunc potestatis suæ augendæ causa, alia concilia corrumpat, et quæ ne cogitata quidem unquam fuerint, ea a sanctis patribus deliberata et constituta esse dicat: utque Camotensis ait pontifices solitos esse sæpe facere, vim adhibeat scripturis, ut habeat plenitudinem potestatis? Quid si abjiciat fidem Christianam, et efficiatur apostata, quales Lyranus ait multos fuisse papas? Tamenne Spiritus Sanctus statim illi pulsabit pectus, atque

⁹² De electione et electi potestate, cap. Significasti.

⁹³ Ad Evagrium.

⁹⁴ Vide Sozomen. Eccles. Hist. lib. iv. cap. 15.

[PART.
VI.]

etiam nolenti, et invito accendet lumen, ne possit errare? Aut ille erit fons omnis juris? et omnis thesaurus sapientiæ atque intelligentiæ in illo, tanquam in scrinio, invenietur? Aut, si ista in illo non sunt, potestne de rebus tantis recte et commode judicare? Aut, si judicare non potest, petit,

[Cap. 6. div. 1.
vi. p. 277.]

ut ista ad se unum omnia referantur? Quid si advocati pontificum, abbates, et episcopi, nihil dissimulent, sed aperte se gerant pro hostibus evangelii, et quod vident, videre nolint, et vim faciant scripturis, et videntes ac scientes depravent atque adulterent verbum Dei: et ea quæ perspicue ac proprie dicta sunt de Christo, nec possunt cuiquam mortalium alii convenire, impure atque impie ad papam transferant? Quid si dicant⁹⁵, papam esse omnia, et super omnia: aut illum ea posse omnia, quæ Christus potest: et papæ Christique unum esse tribunal, et unum consistorium? Aut illum esse lucem illam, quæ venerit in mundum, (quod Christus de se uno pronuntiavit) eumque qui male agit, odisse ac fugere illam lucem: aut alios

[Cap. 6. div. 2.
vi. p. 279.]

episcopos omnes de ejus accipere plenitudine⁹⁶? Postremo, quid si non dissimulanter, aut obscure, sed perspicue et aperte decernant contra expressum verbum Dei? An quidquid isti dicunt, statim erit evangelium? An iste erit exercitus Dei? An ibi Christus præsto erit? An in istorum linguis nabit Spiritus Sanctus? aut illi possunt vere di-

[Cap. 6. div. 3.
vi. p. 280.]

cere, Visum est Spiritui Sancto, et nobis? Petrus quidem a Soto, et ejus astipulator Hosius⁹⁷, nihil dubitant affirmare, concilium illud ipsum, in quo Christus Jesus adjudicatus est morti, habuisse Spiritum propheticum, Spiritum sanctum, Spiritum veritatis: nec falsum aut vanum fuisse, quod episcopi illi dixerunt: Nos habemus legem, et secundum legem nostram debet mori⁹⁸. Illos judicasse (sic enim scribit Hosius) judicii veritatem: omninoque justum fuisse illud decretum, quo ab illis pronuntiatum est, Christum dignum esse qui moreretur. Mirum vero est, non posse istos pro se dicere, et propugnare causam suam, nisi una etiam Annæ, Caia-

⁹⁵ Host. cap. Quanto. Abbas Panor. de Elect. cap. Venerabilis. Cornelius Episc. in Concilio Tridentino. Johan. viii. 12.

⁹⁶ Durandus.

⁹⁷ Hosius contra Brentium, lib. ii.

⁹⁸ Johan. xix. 7.

phæque patrocinentur. Nam qui illud ipsum concilium, ^[PART. VI.] in quo Filius Dei ad crucem ignominiosissime condemnatus est, legitimum dicent fuisse ac probum; quod tandem illi concilium decernent esse vitiosum? Tamen qualia sunt istorum concilia fere omnia, necesse illis fuit, ut ista (de) Caiaphæ Annæque concilio pronuntiarent. Verum, an isti ^[Cap. 7. div. 1. vi. p. 285.] ecclesiam nobis instaurabunt, iidem ipsi iudices iidemque rei? An isti minuent ambitionem fastumque suum? An ipsi seipsos ejicient, aut contra se ferent sententiam, ne episcopi sint indocti, ne ventres pigri, ne cumulent sacerdotia, ne gerant se pro principibus, ne bella gerant? An dilecti pontificum filioli abbates decernent, monachum, qui suo sibi labore victum non quærat, latronem esse? aut fas illi non esse, nec in civitatibus, nec in turba, nec ex alieno vivere: oportere monachum humi cubare: olusculo et ciceribus tueri vitam: incumbere literis, disputare, orare, opus facere, ad ecclesiæ ministerium se parare? Eadem opera Pharisei et Scribæ instaurabunt templum Dei, et ex spelunca latronum restituent nobis domum orationis.

Fuerunt ex ipsis aliqui, qui errores in ecclesiæ complures ^[Cap. 7. div. 2. vi. p. 290.] deprehenderint: Adrianus papa, Æneas Sylvius, Polus cardinalis, Pighius, alique, uti jam diximus. Habuerunt postea concilium Tridenti, eodem loco, quo nunc indicitur. Convenerunt episcopi complures, et abbates, et alii quos oportuit. Erant soli: quidquid ageretur, nemo erat qui obstreperet. Nostros enim homines ab omni conventu prorsus excluserant. Sederunt ibi magna expectatione sex annos. Primis sex mensibus, quasi id magnopere opus esset, multa de sacrosancta Triade, de Patre, de Filio, de Spiritu Sancto, pia quidem, sed non ita illo tempore necessaria, decreverant. Interim tamen ex tot erroribus tam perspicuis, tam confessis, tam manifestis, quem unum errorem correxerunt? A quo genere idololatriæ populum revocarunt? Quam superstitionem sustulerunt? Quam partem tyrannidis et pompæ suæ minuerunt? Quasi vero jam orbis terrarum non videat conspiracyem istam esse, non concilium: et istos episcopos, quos nunc sibi pontifex advocavit, prorsus juratos et addictos esse ejus nomini: nec unquam quidquam facturos, nisi quod illi placere, et ad ejus

[PART.
VI.][Cap. 7. div. 3.
vi. p. 297.]

potentiam augendam facere, et illum velle, videant: aut non ibi numerari sententias potius quam appendi: aut non meliorem partem sæpe a majore superari. Itaque scimus multos sæpe bonos viros, et catholicos episcopos, cum hujusmodi concilia indicerentur, et aperte factionibus et partibus inserviretur, et scirent se tantum luseros esse operam, adversariorum animos prorsus esse obfirmatos, nihil posse promoveri, mansisse domi. Athanasius², cum vocatus esset ab imperatore ad concilium Cæsariense, et viderit se ad infesta adversariorum suorum odia venturum esse, adesce noluit. Idem postea cum venisset ad concilium Syrmianum, et ex hostium suorum ferocia, atque odio, animo rei eventum præ sagiret; statim sarcinas collegit, atque abiit. Joannes Chrysostomus³, quamvis quaternis literis ab imperatore Arcadio vocatus esset ad concilium Arianorum, tamen domi se continuit. Cum Hierosolymorum episcopus Maximus sederet in concilio Palæstino, cum senex Paphnutius manu apprehensum eduxit foras: Non est fas, inquit, nobis consultare de his rebus cum hominibus impiis⁴.

Ad concilium Syrmianum, a quo se subduxit Athanasius, occidentis episcopi venire noluerunt. Cyrillus ab illorum, qui Patropassiani dicebantur, concilio, per literas appellavit⁵. Ad Mediolanense concilium episcopus Treverensis Paulinus, alique complures, cum viderent conatus et potentiam Auxentii, venire recusarunt. Frustra enim videbant se ituros eo, ubi non ratio, sed factio audiretur; et ubi causæ non iudicio, sed studio disceptarentur.

Atque illi quantumvis habebant infestos et obstinatos adversarios, tamen si venissent, audiri saltem in concilio libere potuissent.

[Cap. 8. div. 1.
vi. p. 301.]

Nunc autem cum nemo nostrum ne sedere quidem, aut omnino videri in istorum consessu, nedum libere audiri possit; cum pontificum legati, patriarchæ, archiepiscopi, episcopi, abbates omnes conjurati, omnes eadem culpa constricti, omnes eodem sacramento obstricti, soli sedeant, et

² Theodoret. Eccl. Hist. lib. i. cap. 28.

³ Tripart. lib. x. cap. 13.

⁴ Euseb. i. cap. 17.

⁵ Tripart. Soz. lib. v. cap. 15.

soli jus habeant ferendi suffragii : et postremo, quasi ipsi nihil egerint, omnia sua judicia papæ unius voluntati, libidinique subjiciant : videlicet, ut ille, quem oportuit potius causam dicere, de seipso pronunciet : cum vetus illa, et Christiana libertas, quam æquum erat in Christianis conciliis esse maximam, prorsus de concilio sublata sit : mirari hodie non debent homines prudentes ac pii, si nos id nunc facimus, quod olim in simili causa, a tot patribus et catholicis episcopis factum vident : ut quoniam audiri in concilio non possumus, et principum legati habentur ludibrio, et nos omnes, quasi res jam antea confecta, et constituta sit, ante judicium condemnatur, domum manere malimus, et rem omnem Deo committere, quam eo proficisci, ubi nec locum habituri simus, nec quidquam possimus promovere. Verum nostram injuriam patienter et sedate ferre possumus. Sed cur reges Christianos, et pios principes excludunt a consessu suo? Cur eos vel ita incivilter a se, vel ita contumeliose dimittunt, ut quasi homines Christiani non sint, aut judicare non possint, nolint eos religionis Christianæ causam cognoscere, et ecclesiarum suarum statum intelligere : aut si auctoritatem suam interponant, et faciant id quod possunt, quod jubentur, quod debent, quodque et Davidem, et Salomonem, et alios bonos principes fecisse scimus, ut ipsis aut dormientibus, aut nefarie resistentibus, sacerdotum libidinem coerceant, eosque et ad officium faciendum adigant, et in officio contineant : ut idola evertant : ut superstitiones minuant : ut Dei cultum instaurent : cur statim clamant, illos omnia turbare, in alienum officium irrumpere, et improbe atque immodeste facere? Quæ scriptura principem Christianum ab hujusmodi causarum cognitione unquam repulit? Quis præter istos solos unquam ista jura decrevit?

[Cap. 9. div. 1.
et 2. vi. p.
308.]

At civiles, inquit, principes rempub. atque arma tractare didicerunt ; religionis mysteria non intelligunt. Quid ergo papa hodie aliud est, quam monarcha aut princeps? Quid cardinales? Quos nunc vix alios esse fas est, quam principum et regum filios. Quid patriarchæ, quid magna ex parte archiepiscopi, quid episcopi, quid abbates in regno pontificio aliud hodie sunt, quam civiles principes, quam

[Cap. 9. div. 3.
vi. p. 332.]

[PART.
VI.]

duces, quam comites, quocunque incedant, magnifice stipati: sæpe etiam torquati, et catenati?

Amictum quidem habent illi interdum aliquem, cruces, columnas, galeros, tiaras, pallia; quam pompam veteres episcopi, Chrysostomus, Augustinus, Ambrosius, non habebant. Præter ista vero quid docent, quid dicunt, quid faciunt, quid vivunt, quod deceat non tantum episcopum, sed etiam hominem Christianum? An tanti est titulum inanem gerere, et mutata solum veste, appellari episcopum?

[Cap. 10. div.
1. vi. p. 338.]

Certe illis solis, qui ista nec sciunt, nec scire omnino volunt, nec, nisi quod ad culinam et ventrem attinet, partem ullam religionis teruncii faciunt, permitti rerum omnium summam, illos solos iudices fieri, et tanquam cæcos in specula collocari: principem vero Christianum, recte sentientem, stare truncum et stipitem, non suffragari, non sententiam dicere, tantum quid illi velint aut jubeant, observare, sine auribus, sine oculis, sine animo, sine pectore: quidquid ab istis imponatur, sine exceptione recipere, et cæco iudicio imperata facere, quantumvis ea blasphema sint atque impia, etiamsi eos jubeant religionem universam extinguere, et Christum ipsum in crucem tollere: et superbum, et contumeliosum, et iniquum est, et a principibus Christianis, et prudentibus non ferendum. Quid enim? An Caiaphas et Annas ista videre possunt? David et Ezechias non possunt? Et an cardinali, homini militari et sanguinem spiranti, in concilio sedere licet? Imperatori,

[Cap. 11. div.
1. vi. p. 339.]

aut regi Christiano non licet? Nam nos quidem, nihil nostris magistratibus tribuimus aliud, quam quod illis et ex verbo Dei tributum scimus, et optimarum rerum publico exemplo comprobatur.

[Cap. 11. div.
2. vi. p. 342.]

Præterquam enim quod principi fideli a Deo mandata est cura utriusque tabulæ, ut intelligat ad officium suum non civilem tantum rem, sed etiam sacram et ecclesiasticam pertinere: præterquam quod Deus sæpe regem, ac discrete jubet lucos succidere, idolorum statuas et aras evertere, librum legis sibi describere; quodque illum Esaias ait⁵, ecclesiæ patronum, et nutritum esse oportere:

[Cap. 11. div.
3. vi. p. 346.]

⁵ Esai. xlix. 23.

præter, inquam, hæc omnia, ex historiis et optimorum tem-
porum exemplis videmus pios principes procurationem ec-
clesiarum ab officio suo nunquam putasse alienam.

[PART.
VI.][Cap. 11. div.
4 et 5. vi. p.
352.]

Moses ⁶, civilis magistratus, ac ductor populi, omnem religionis et sacrorum rationem et accepit a Deo, et populo tradidit: et Aaronem episcopum de aureo vitulo, et de violata religione, vehementer et graviter castigavit. Josue ⁷,
etsi non aliud erat quam magistratus civilis, tamen cum primum inauguraretur, et præficeretur populo, accepit mandata nominatim de religione, deque colendo Deo.

[Cap. 11. div.
6. vi. p. 359.]

David rex ⁸, cum omnis jam religio ab impio rege Saule prorsus esset dissipata, reduxit arcam Dei, hoc est, religionem restituit: nec tantum adfuit ut admonitor aut hortator operis, sed etiam psalmos et hymnos dedit, et classes disposuit, et pompam instituit, et quodammodo præfuit sacerdotibus.

[Cap. 11. div.
7. vi. p. 361.]

Salomon rex ⁹ ædificavit templum Domino, quod ejus pater David animo tantum destinaverat: et postremo orationem egregiam habuit ad populum de religione, et cultu Dei: et Abiatharum episcopum ¹⁰ postea summovit, et in ejus locum Sadocum surrogavit. Cumque postea templum Dei fœdum in modum esset sacerdotum vitio et negligentia contaminatum, Ezechias ¹¹ illud rex jussit a ruderibus et sordibus repurgari, accendi lumina, suffitus adoleri, et veteri ritu sacra fieri: æneum etiam serpentem, qui tum a populo impie colebatur, tolli, et in pulverem redigi. Josaphat rex ¹², excelsa et lucos, quibus impediri videbat cultum Dei, et populum a communi templo, quod erat Hierosolymis, ad quod ex omni parte regni quotannis eundum erat, privata superstitione retineri, evertit et sustulit. Josias ¹³ rex diligenter admonuit sacerdotes et episcopos officii sui. Joas ¹⁴ rex repressit luxum et insolentiam sacerdotum. Jehu ¹⁵ impios prophetas neci dedit. Et, ne plura ex sacris scripturis exempla commemoremus, ac potius

[Cap. 11. div.
8. vi. p. 363.][Cap. 11. div.
9. vi. p. 364.][Cap. 11. div.
10. vi. p. 366.][Cap. 11. div.
11. ibid.][Cap. 12. div.
1. vi. p. 367.]⁶ Exod. xx.⁷ Jos. i.⁸ 1 Par. xiii.⁹ 2 Par. vi.¹⁰ 3 Reg. ii. 35.¹¹ 2 Par. xxix.¹² 4 Reg. xviii. 2 Par. xvii.¹³ 4 Reg. xxiii.¹⁴ 4 Reg. xii.¹⁵ 4 Reg. x.

[PART.
VI.][Cap. 12. div.
2. vi. p. 371.][Cap. 12. div.
3. vi. p. 393.][Cap. 12. div.
4. vi. p. 395.][Cap. 12. div.
5. vi. p. 408.][Cap. 13. div.
1. ibid.][Cap. 13. div.
2. vi. p. 416.]

a Christo nato quemadmodum in evangelio ecclesia administrata sit, consideremus : olim imperatores Christiani indicebant episcoporum concilia : Constantinus, Nicænum : Theodosius primus, Constantinopolitanum : Theodosius secundus, Ephesinum : Marcianus, Chalcedonense : cumque Ruffinus allegasset synodum, quasi quæ pro se faceret, ejus adversarius Hieronymus, ut eum refutaret, Doce, inquit, quis eam imperator jusserit convocari ? Idem in Epitaphio Paulæ citat literas imperatorum, qui episcopos Latinos, Græcosque Romam accersiri jusserint.

Omnino per annos quingentos imperator solus agebat conventus sacros, et episcoporum concilia celebrabat.

Quo magis nunc miramur importunitatem episcopi Romani, qui, quod sciat, integris rebus, fuisse jus imperatoris, nunc autem postquam reges in partem Cæsareæ majestatis devenerunt, esse jus commune omnium principum ; id ita temere uni adscribat sibi, et satis esse putet, voluntatem suam de habendo concilio, cum principe orbis terrarum viro¹⁶, tanquam cum famulo suo communicare.

Quod si imperatoris Ferdinandi modestia tanta est, fortasse, quod artes pontificias non satis norit, ut hanc injuriam ferre possit : pontifex tamen pro sua sanctitate, injuriam illi facere, et jus sibi alienum arrogare non debebat.

At convocabat quidem tum, inquit aliquis, imperator concilia, quod Romanus episcopus nondum ad istam magnitudinem pervenisset : tamen ne tum quidem aut una sedebat cum episcopis in concilio, aut omnino in deliberatione auctoritatem suam ullam in partem interponebat. Immo vero, ut Theodoretus ait, imperator Constantinus¹⁷, in concilio Nicæno non solum una sedebat, sed etiam episcopos, quemadmodum causa ex apostolicis prophetisque literis cognoscenda esset, admonebat. In disputationibus, inquit, de rebus divinis, propositam nobis habemus, quam sequamur, doctrinam Spiritus Sancti. Evangelici enim et apostolici libri, et prophetarum oracula satis ostendunt, quid nobis de voluntate Dei sit sentiendum. Theo-

¹⁶ Ut Pius IV. in Bulla sua ad Imper. Ferdinandum, c. 5.

¹⁷ Hist. Eccl. lib. i. c. 7.

dosius imperator, ut ait Socrates ¹⁸, non solum sedit inter episcopos, sed etiam causæ disceptationi præfuit, et hæreticorum scripta laceravit, et catholicorum sententiam comprobavit.

In Chalcedonensi concilio ¹⁹ magistratus civilis Dioscorum, Juvenalem, Thalassium, episcopos, sua sententia pro hæreticis condemnavit, eosque de illo gradu ecclesiæ deji-
ciendos esse censuit. [Cap. 14. div. 1. vi. p. 419.]

In Constantinopolitano concilio tertio ²⁰, civilis magistratus Constantinus non solum sedit inter episcopos, sed etiam subscripsit cum episcopis: Legimus, inquit, et subscripsimus. In concilio Arausicano secundo, legati principum, viri patricii, non tantum sententiam de religione dixerunt, sed etiam inter episcopos subscripserunt. Sic enim in illo concilio scribitur ad extremum; Petrus, Marcellinus, Felix, Liberius, viri clarissimi, et illustres præfecti prætorii Galliarum, atque patricii, consentientes subscripserunt. Syagrius, Opilio, Pantagathus, Deodatus, Cariattho, Marcellus, viri clarissimi, subscripserunt. [Cap. 14. div. 2. vi. p. 424.]

Quod si præfecti prætorii et viri patricii subscribere in concilio potuerunt, imperatores et reges non potuerunt? Non sane opus erat, rem ita perspicuam tot verbis et tam prolixè prosequi, nisi nobis res cum illis esset, qui omnia clarissima, etiam ea quæ vident quæque oculis usurpant, tamen contentionis et vincendi studio negare solent. Imperator Justinianus legem tulit de corrigendis moribus, et de frænanda insolentia sacerdotum; et quamvis esset Christianus et catholicus imperator, tamen duos papas successores Petri, vicarios Christi, Sylverium et Vigilium, de papatu dejecit. [Cap. 14. div. 4. vi. p. 425.]

Jam vero qui auctoritatem sumunt in episcopos: qui a Deo accipiunt mandata de religione: qui reducunt arcam Dei, componunt sacros psalmos, præsumunt sacerdotibus, ædificant templa, habent conciones de cultu Dei: qui templa repurgant, demoliuntur excelsa, incendunt lucos: qui sacerdotes admonent officii, et illis scribunt leges vitæ: qui prophetas impios occidunt: qui episcopos summovent: qui [Cap. 15. div. 1. vi. p. 442.]

¹⁸ Socrates, lib. i. c. 5.

Eccl. Hist. lib. ii. c. 4. Actione 1.

¹⁹ Socr. lib. v. c. 4. Vide Evagr.

²⁰ Action. 1.

[PART.
VI.]

cogunt concilia episcoporum: qui cum episcopis una sedent, eosque quid agendum sit, instituunt: qui episcopum hæreticum adjudicant supplicio: qui de religione cognoscunt: qui subscribunt: qui pronunciant: atque hæc omnia, non alieno jussu, sed nomine suo, et recte, et pie faciunt: an ad eos dicemus religionis curam non pertinere? Aut magistratum Christianum, qui hisce rebus sese admisceat, aut improbe, aut immodeste, aut impie facere? His rebus imperatores et reges, antiquissimi et Christianissimi, sese admiscuerunt: non tamen ea causa unquam notati sunt aut impietatis, aut immodestiæ. Et quis quærat, vel principes magis catholicos, vel exempla illustriora?

[Cap. 15. div.
2. vi. p. 447.]

Quod si hoc illis licebat, cum essent civiles tantum magistratus, et præessent rebus publicis; quid hodie peccaverunt nostri principes, quibus, cum eo loco sint, idem tamen non liceat? Aut quæ tanta vis doctrinæ, judicii, sanctitatis est in istis, ut præter consuetudinem omnium veterum et catholicorum episcoporum, qui cum principibus viris de religione deliberarunt, nunc principes Christianos a causæ cognitione, et a suo congressu rejiciant? Sed recte illi cavent sibi, regnoque suo, quod alioqui vident brevi esse ruiturum. Nam si illi, quos Deus in altissimo gradu collocavit, viderent, atque intelligerent istorum artes: contemni ab illis jussa Christi: obscurari et extinguere lucem evangelii: sibi fucum fieri: imprudentibus illudi, atque obstrui aditum ad regnum Dei: nunquam illi se vel ita superbe despici, vel ita contumeliose haberi ludibrio, ita facile paterentur. Nunc autem illi eos inscitia et cæcitate obstrictos sibi habent atque obnoxios.

[Cap. 16. div.
1. vi. p. 450.]

Nos quidem, uti diximus, de mutanda religione, nihil temere aut insolenter, nihil nisi cunctanter, et magna cum deliberatione fecimus: neque id unquam animum induxissemus facere, nisi nos et manifesta, atque indubitata voluntas Dei nobis in sacrosanctis scripturis patefacta, et salutis nostræ ratio coegisset. Etsi enim discessimus ab illa ecclesia, quam isti appellant catholicam, et ea re nobis, apud illos qui judicare non possunt, invidiam faciunt; tamen id satis est nobis, (satisque esse debet homini prudenti et pio, et de æterna vita cogitanti,) nos ab ea ecclesia

[PART.
VI.]

discessisse, quæ errare potuerit, quam Christus, qui errare non potest, tanto ante prædixerit erraturam, quamque nos ipsi oculis perspicue videbamus a sanctis patribus, ab apostolis, a Christo ipso, a primitiva et catholica ecclesia discessisse. Accessimus autem, quantum maxime potuimus, ad ecclesiam apostolorum, et veterum catholicorum episcoporum, et patrum, quam scimus adhuc fuisse integram, utque Tertullianus ait, incorruptam virginem, nulla dum idololatria, nec errore gravi ac publico contaminatam: nec tantum doctrinam nostram, sed etiam sacramenta, precumque publicarum formam ad illorum ritus et instituta direximus. Utque Christum ipsum, et omnes fere pios fecisse scimus, religionem ab istis turpiter neglectam et depravatam, ad originem, et ad primordia revocavimus. Inde enim putavimus instaurationem petendam esse, unde prima religionis initia ducta essent. Hæc enim ratio, inquit antiquissimus pater Tertullianus, valet adversus omnes hæreses: id esse verum, quodcunque primum: id esse adulterum, quodcunque posterius. Irenæus sæpe ad antiquissimas ecclesias provocavit, quæ Christo fuissent viciniore, quasque credibile vix esset erravisse. Jam vero, cur ea hodie ratio non initur? Cur ad antiquarum ecclesiarum similitudinem non redimus? Cur id a nobis hodie audiri non potest, quod olim in concilio Nicæno, a tot episcopis, et catholicis patribus, nullo refragante, pronunciatum est, *ἔθῃ ἀρχαία κρατεῖτω*. Esdras cum reficere vellet ruinas templi Dei, non misit Ephesum, quamvis ibi esset Dianæ templum pulcherrimum, et ornatissimum: cumque vellet sacra et cæremonias restituere, non misit Romam, quamvis fortasse audisset ibi esse hecatombas, solitaurilia, lectisternia, supplicationes, et libros Numæ Pompilii rituales. Satis ille sibi putavit fore, si exemplar veteris templi, quod ab initio Salomon ad Dei præscriptum excitaverat, et veteres illos ritus ac cæremonias, quas Deus ipse Mosi nominatim scripserat, haberet ante oculos, et sequeretur.

[Cap. 16. div.
2. vi. p. 453.][Cap. 17. div.
et 2. vi. p.
463.]

Aggæus propheta, cum jam templum ab Esdra reffectum esset, et populo causa oblata satis justa videri potuisset sibi de tanto Dei Optimi Maximi beneficio gratulandi: tamen excussit omnibus lacrymas, quod qui erant adhuc super-

[PART.
VI.]

stites, et priora templi ædificia, antequam a Babylonîis diriperetur, viderant, meminissent multum adhuc ab ea pulchritudine abesse, quæ olim fuerat. Tum enim demum putassent templum egregie instauratum, si ad pristinum exemplar, et veterem templi majestatem respondisset.

Divus Paulus ut cœnam Domini, quam Corinthii jam tum cœperant corrumpere, repurgaret, proposuit illis institutionem Christi, quam sequerentur: Id, inquit²¹, ego vobis tradidi, quod acceperam a Domino. Et Christus, ut Pharisæorum errorem refelleret: Ad initia, inquit, redeundum est: ab initio non fuit sic.

Utque sacerdotum sordes, et avaritiam coargueret, et templum purgaret: Hæc, inquit, ab initio, domus orationis fuit, ubi populus omnis pie ac caste precaretur: atque ita vos oportebat nunc quoque eam instituere. Non enim ea causa extructa fuit, ut esset spelunca latronum.

Sic omnes in sacris scripturis, pii et laudati principes, eo maxime nomine laudati sunt, quod ambulassent in viis David patris sui; videlicet quod ad primordia et ad fontes rediissent, et religionem in integrum restituisent.

Itaque nos cum videremus omnia ab istis prorsus esse pessundata, et in templo Dei, præter miseram ruinam, nihil esse reliqui; consultissimum esse duximus, ut illas nobis ecclesias proponeremus, quas certo sciremus, et non errasse, et missas privatas, et preces ignotas ac barbaras, et istam sacrorum corruptionem, atque alias ineptias non habuisse.

Et cum templum Domini cuperemus in integrum restitutum, non aliud fundamentum quærere voluimus, quam quod jam olim ab apostolis sciremus esse jactum, quod est servator noster Jesus Christus.

Cumque audiremus Deum ipsum nobis loquentem in verbo suo, et videremus exempla illustria veteris et primitivæ ecclesiæ: incerta autem esset concilii generalis expectatio, et eventus multo incertior: maxime vero, cum certi essemus de voluntate Dei, et nefas esse duceremus nimium sollicitos esse, atque anxios de sentiis hominum: non potuimus amplius cum carne et sanguine deliberare: illud

²¹ 1 Cor. xi. 23.

potius fecimus, quod et recte posset fieri, et a piis hominibus, et catholicis episcopis sæpe multis factum esset: ut provinciali synodo nostris ecclesiis prospiceremus. Sic enim veteres patres scimus solitos esse experiri, antequam ad publicum orbis terrarum concilium veniretur. Extant hodie canones scripti in conciliis municipalibus, Carthagine [1562 Carthagini] sub Cypriano, Ancyrae, Neocæsariæ, Gangræ, etiam in Paphlagonia, ut quidam putant, antequam Nicæni Concilii œcumenici nomen auditum esset. Ad hunc modum olim sine concilio generali statim domi privata disceptatione occursum est Pelagianis et Donatistis. Sic cum imperator Constantinus aperte studeret Auxentio Ariarum partium episcopo, Ambrosius [*al.* Athanasius] episcopus Christianus, non ad concilium generale, (in quo, videlicet, propter imperatoris potentiam, et studium partium videbat nihil posse fieri) sed ad clerum populumque suum, hoc est, ad provincialem synodum provocavit. Sic decretum est in concilio Nicæno, ut in singulos annos bis, in Carthaginensi, ut minimum semel, episcoporum conventus in singulis provinciis haberentur: quod Chalcedonense concilium ait, ea causa fuisse factum, ut si qui errores aut abusus uspiam emerissent, statim in ipso vestigio, ubi nati fuissent, extinguerentur. Ita, cum Secundus et Palladius Aquileiense concilium, quod non esset generale ac publicum, repudiarent; Ambrosius episcopus Mediolanensis respondit, non debere illud novum cuiquam videri, aut peregrinum, si occidentis episcopi convocent synodos, et agant conventus provinciales: id enim antea et ab occidentalibus episcopis non raro, et a Græcis sæpe factum esse. Ita Carolus Magnus imperator concilium habuit provinciale in Germania, contra concilium Nicænum secundum, de tollendis imaginibus. Ne nobis quidem prorsus inaudita, aut nova est ea ratio. Nos enim habuimus aliquando in Anglia synodos provinciales, et domesticis legibus ecclesias nostras ordinavimus. Quid multis? Certe concilia illa plenissima et maxima, et quibus isti solent tantopere gloriari, si cum omnibus ecclesiis, quæ per totum orbem terrarum agnoscunt et confitentur nomen Christi, conferantur; quid obsecro aliud videri possunt,

[PART.
VI.]

quam privata quædam episcoporum concilia, et synodi provinciales? Nam etsi forte Italia, Gallia, Hispania, Anglia, Germania, Dania, Scotia conveniat: absit autem Asia, Græcia, Armenia, Persia, Media, Mesopotamia, Ægyptus, Æthiopia, India, Mauritania, quibus in locis omnibus, et Christiani homines multi sunt, et episcopi: quomodo potest cuiquam sano hujusmodi concilium videri generale? Aut cum tot partes orbis absint, quomodo possunt vere dicere, se habere consensum orbis terrarum? Aut quale tandem erat illud concilium Tridentinum? aut quomodo dici potuit generale, cum ad illud ex omnibus regnis et regionibus Christianis, quadraginta tantum episcopi convenissent, et ex illis aliqui ita diserti, ut remittendi esse viderentur ad grammaticos: ita vero docti, ut nunquam perlegerint sacras literas? Quicquid est, veritas evangelii Jesu Christi non pendet a conciliis; aut, ut Paulus ait ²⁴, ab humano die. Quod si illi, quibus ecclesia Dei curæ esse oportuit, sapere nolint, et officio suo defuerint, atque animos suos contra Deum et ejus Christum obfirmaverint, et rectas vias Domini pervertere perrexerint: Deus lapides excitabit, et pueros infantes disertos faciet; ut semper existant aliqui, a quibus istorum mendacia refutentur. Potest enim Deus, non solum sine conciliis, sed etiam invitis conciliis, et tueri, et promoveri regnum suum. Multæ, inquit Salomon ²⁵, sunt cogitationes in humano corde: sed Domini consilium manet firmum. Non enim est sapientia, non est prudentia, non est consilium contra Dominum. Humanis operibus, inquit Hilarius ²⁶, exstructa non durant: aliter ædificanda, aliter conservanda ecclesia est. Ea enim posita est ²⁷ in fundamentis apostolorum et prophetarum, et continetur uno angulari lapide, Christo Jesu. Multa [ed. 1562 l. multo] vero clarissime et ad hæc tempora appositissime D. Hieronymus: Quosunque, inquit ²⁸, diabolus deceperit, et quasi suavi et pernicioso carmine Sirenarum illexerit ad dormiendum, eos

[Cap. 18, div.
1. vi. p. 479.][Cap. 18, div.
2. vi. p. 480.][Cap. 19, div.
1. vi. p. 482.]²⁴ 1 Cor. iv. 3.²⁵ Prov. xix. 21.²⁶ Hilarius in Psal. cxxvi.²⁷ Ephes. ii. 20.²⁸ In Prophetam Naum. cap. iii.
ad finem cap. Eph. v. 14.

excitat sermo divinus, et dicit: Surge qui dormis, elevare, et illuminabit te Christus. In adventu ergo Christi, et sermonis Dei, et doctrinæ ecclesiasticæ, et consummationis Ninivæ et speciosissimæ meretricis, elevabitur populus et properabit, qui sub magistris antea fuerat sopitus; et ibit ad montes scripturarum: ibi inveniet montes Mosen, Jesum filium Nave: montes prophetas: montes Novi Testamenti, apostolos et evangelistas. Et cum ad tales montes confugerit, et in hujusmodi montium fuerit lectione versatus: si non invenerit qui eum doceat, (messis enim erit multa, operarii pauci:) tamen et populi studium comprobabitur, quod confugerint ad hujusmodi montes, et magistrorum negligentia coarguetur. Hæc Hieronymus, ita perspicue, ut nihil opus sit interprete: ita ad ea, quæ nos jam oculis videmus evenisse, accomodate, ut nobis quidem videatur, universum statum temporum nostrorum, et ornatissimæ illius meretricis Babyloniciæ ruinam, et ecclesiæ Dei instaurationem, et cæcitatem atque ignaviam episcoporum, et studium atque alacritatem populi, quasi spiritu prophetico prædicere, et ante oculos nostros constituere voluisse. Quis enim tam cæcus est, ut non videat istos illos magistros esse, a quibus populus, ut Hieronymus ait, in errorem inductus sit, et consopitus: aut Niniven istorum Romam pulcherrimis aliquando fucatam coloribus, nunc detracta persona, et melius videri, et minoris fieri: aut homines pios excitatos tanquam e gravi somno ad lucem evangelii, et ad voces Dei, nihil expectatis hujusmodi magistrorum conciliis, contulisse se ad montes scripturarum?

At saltem (inquiet aliquis) injussu Romani pontificis ista tentari non oportuit: illum enim unum esse nodum et vinculum societatis Christianæ: illum unum esse sacerdotem illum Levitici generis, quem Deus significaverit in Deuteronomio, a quo consilium in rebus arduis et veritatis judicium petendum sit: si quis illius judicio non obtemperet, illum in conspectu fratrum suorum oportere interfici: illum, quidquid agat, non posse a quoquam mortalium judicari: Christum in cælis regnare, illum in terris: illum unum posse, quidquid Christus, aut Deus ipse potest:

[Cap. 20. div.
I. vi. p. 492.]

[PART.
VI.]

illius enim et Christi unum esse consistorium: sine illo nullam esse fidem, nullam spem, nullam ecclesiam: qui ab illo discedat, eum abjicere et repudiare salutem suam. Hæc canonistæ, parasiti pontificum, non nimium modeste illi quidem; vix enim plura, certe non ampliora, potuissent de Christo ipso dicere.

[Cap. 20. div.
2. vi. p. 493.]

Nos quidem non voluptatis ullius humanæ, aut commodi causa a pontifice discessimus. Atque utinam potius ille ita se gereret, ne opus esset discessionem. Verum ita res erat: nos, nisi illo relicto, non potuimus ad Christum pervenire. Neque ille nunc aliud fœdus nobiscum ferire vult, quam quale olim rex Ammonitarum Naas ferire voluit²⁹ cum Jabensibus, ut illis omnibus dextros oculos effoderet. Eripere enim vult nobis sacras scripturas, evangelium salutis nostræ, et omnem illam spem quam habemus in Christo Jesu. Aliis enim conditionibus pacem non posse convenire.

[Cap. 20. div.
3. vi. p. 494.]

Nam quod quidam tantopere solent prædicare, papam solum esse successorem Petri, quasi ea causa Spiritum Sanctum in sinu gerat, et errare non possit, leve ac nugatorium est. Animo pio, ac Deum timenti, promissa est Dei gratia; non cathedris et successionibus. Divitiæ, inquit, Hieronymus, potentiores episcopum facere possunt: omnes tamen episcopi, quicumque sunt, sunt successores apostolorum. Quod si locus et inauguratio sola satis est; et Manasses successit Davidi, et Caiaphas Aaroni, et idolum sæpe stetit in templo Dei. Archidamus olim Lacedæmonius, multa de se prædicabat, quod esset ex Hercule oriundus: ejus insolentiam ita refutabat Nicostratus: Atqui tu ex Hercule oriundus non videris: nam ille malos homines interfecit, tu ex bonis malos facis. Cumque Pharisæi jactarent successiones suas, et genus, et sanguinem Abrahami; Vos, inquit Christus³⁰, quæritis me interficere, hominem qui veritatem vobis locutus sum, quam audiavi a Deo: hoc Abraham nunquam fecit: vox ex patre Diabolo estis, et ejus voluntati vultis obsequi.

[Cap. 21. div.
1. vi. p. 498.]

Tamen ut aliquid successioni largiamur, an solus papa

²⁹ 1 Reg. xi. 2.

³⁰ Johan. viii. 40, 41.

successit Petro? Qua ergo in re: qua in religione: in qua functione: in qua parte vitæ illi successit? Quid unquam aut Petrus papæ simile habuit, aut papa Petro? Nisi hoc forte velint dicere: Petrum, cum esset Romæ, nunquam docuisse evangelium: nunquam pavisse gregem: abstulisse claves regni cælorum: abscondisse thesauros domini sui: tantum sedisse in Laterano, et omnia spatia purgatorii, et suppliciorum genera digito descripsisse: animas miseras, alias in cruciatum relegasse: alias, accepta mercede, repente pro arbitrio exemisse: missas privatas, quæ in omnibus angulis dicerentur, tradidisse: sacra mysteria summissa voce, et aliena lingua mussitasse: eucharistiam in omnibus templis et altaribus collocasse: eamque ante se, quocunque incederet, in asturcone gradario cum luminibus et tintinabulis circumtulisse: oleum, ceram, lanam, campanas, calices, templa, altaria, sacro anhelitu consecrasse: jubilæa, gratias, immunitates, expectationes, præventiones, annatas, pallia, usum palliorum, bullas, indulgentias, diplomata vendidisse: sese caput ecclesiæ, et summum pontificem, et episcoporum episcopum, et solum sanctissimum appellasse: in alienas ecclesias jus et auctoritatem sibi usurpasse: ab omni se civili potestate exemisse: bella gessisse: principes inter se commississe: in aurata sella, corona lemniscata, apparatu Persico, regali sceptro, aureo diademate, lucen-
tibus gemmis in hominum nobilium cervicibus equitasse. Hæc scilicet Petrus olim Romæ fecit, eaque successoribus suis quasi per manus tradidit. Hæc enim a papis hodie Romæ fiunt: atque ita fiunt, quasi aliud fieri nihil debeat. Aut, nisi hoc malint fortasse dicere, papam ea nunc facere omnia, quæ olim scimus fecisse Petrum: discurrere in omnes terras: docere evangelium, non tantum publice, sed etiam privatim, per singulas domos: instare opportune, im-
portune, tempestive, intempestive: opus facere evangelistæ: implere ministerium Christi: esse speculatorem domus Israel: accipere oracula, et voces Dei, easque ut acceperit, ita populo reddere: esse sal terræ: esse lucem mundi: non seipsum pascere, sed gregem: non implicare se civilibus negotiis hujus vitæ: non exercere dominium in populum Domini: non id quærere, ut sibi ab aliis mini-

[PART.
VI.]

stretur, sed ipsum potius aliis ministrare: omnes episcopos putare socios esse suos, et pares: subjectum esse principibus tanquam a Deo missis: reddere quod Cæsaris est, Cæsari: quodque veteres episcopi Romani sine exceptione fecerunt, imperatorem dominum suum appellare. Hæc nisi nunc papæ faciant, et nisi ea quæ diximus Petrus fecerit, nihil est quod de nomine Petri, et de ista successione

[Cap. 22. div.
1. vi. p. 502.]

tantopere glorientur. Quod autem de secessione nostra querantur, et nos ad societatem et fidem suam revocent, multo minus. Cobilonem, aiunt, quendam Lacedæmonium, cum fœderis ferendi causa missus esset legatus ad regem Persarum, et aulicos forte invenisset ludentes aleam, statim re infecta, rediisse domum: rogatum cur neglexisset ea facere quæ publice acceperat in mandatis, respondisse, quod ignominiosum existimasset id fore reipublicæ, si fœdus percussisset cum aleatoribus. At, si nos ad pontificem, pontificiosque errores redire animum induceremus, et fœdus non tantum cum aleatoribus sed etiam cum hominibus longe nequioribus feriremus; esset id nobis non tantum ad famam ignominiosum, sed etiam ad inflammandam adversus nos iram Dei, et ad opprimendam extinguendamque conscientiam nostram perniciosum. Nam

[Cap. 22. div.
2. vi. p. 504.]

nos quidem discessimus ab illo, quem videbamus multa jam sæcula cæcasse orbem terrarum; ab illo, qui nimium insolenter dicere solebat, se errare non posse, et quidquid ageret, non posse se a quoquam mortalium, non a regibus, non ab imperatoribus, non a toto clero, non ab universo populo judicari; non, si mille animas secum abduceret ad inferos; ab illo, qui sibi imperium sumebat, non tantum in homines, sed etiam in angelos Dei, ut irent, redirent, ducerent animas in purgatorium, et easdem reducerent, cum ipse vellet: quem Gregorius clarissime dicebat esse præcursorem et antesignanum Antichristi, et a fide catholica defecisse: a quo coryphæi nostri illi, qui evangelio, atque agnitæ veritati se opponunt, ad unum omnes jampridem ultro, et libenter discesserunt: et nunc etiam ab eodem non inviti discederent, nisi eos inconstantiae nota, et pudor, et populi de se existimatio impediret. Postremo, ab illo discessimus, cui obstricti non eramus, quique præter

[PART.
VI.]

genium quendam loci, et successionem, quod pro se diceret nihil habuit. Et nos quidem ab illo longe omnium justissime discessimus. Nostri enim reges, illi etiam qui auctoritatem et fidem episcoporum Romanensium observantissime sequebantur, satis jam olim senserunt jugum et tyrannidem regni pontificii. Romani enim episcopi et Henrico regi nostro, ejus nominis secundo, diadema de capite detraxerunt, eumque abjecta omni majestate, privato tantum habitu, ut esset suis omnibus ludibrio, ad legatum suum venire demissum et supplicem voluerunt. Et in regem nostrum Joannem, episcopos et monachos, et nonnullam etiam partem nobilitatis armaverunt, et populum omnem jurejurando, quo illi erant obstricti, liberarunt; eumque postremo nefarie per summum scelus, non tantum regno, sed etiam vita exuerunt; et Henricum ejus nominis octavum, nobilissimum principem, diris et fulminibus defixerunt: et in illum, modo Cæsarem, modo Gallum commoverunt; quodque in ipsis erat, regnum nostrum prædæ ac direptioni exposuerunt: homines insani ac fatui, qui aut tantum regem, larvis, et crepitaculis perterrefieri posse crederent, aut tantum regnum tam facile uno quasi bolo devorari. Et quasi hæc omnia non essent satis, universam etiam provinciam vectigalem habere voluerunt: et ex ea quotannis census injustissimos exegerunt. Tanti, videlicet, nobis constitit amicitia urbis Romæ. Quod si illi nobis ista imposturis, et malis artibus extorserunt, nihil causæ est, cur non illis eadem legitimis rationibus, et bonis legibus possint eripi. At si ea illis reges nostri in illa caligine superiorum temporum, inducti opinione aliqua simulatæ illorum sanctitatis, religionis ergo, ultro, et liberaliter donaverunt; postea, animadverso errore, a posteris regibus, qui eadem potestate sunt, possunt auferri. Irrita enim est donatio, nisi donatoris voluntate comprobetur; voluntas autem videri non potest, quam error obfuscaturque impedit.

[Cap. 23. div.
2. vi. p. 510.]

Habes, Christiane lector, non esse novum, si hodie postliminio restituta, et quasi renascens religio Christiana contumeliis et convitiis accipiat: id enim et Christo ipsi, et apostolis accidisse. Tamen ne tu te istis adversariorum

[Vol. vi. p.
522.]

[PART.
VI.]

nostrorum clamoribus abduci, et tibi imponi patiaris: exposuimus tibi universam rationem religionis nostræ: quid de Deo Patre, quid de ejus unico Filio Jesu Christo, quid de ecclesia, quid de sacramentis, quid de ministerio, quid de sacris scripturis, quid de cæremoniis, quid de omni parte persuasionis Christianæ sentiamus. Diximus nos omnes antiquas hæreses, quas aut sacrosanctæ scripturæ, aut vetera concilia condemnarunt, ut pestes et perniciēs animorum detestari: nos disciplinam ecclesiasticam, quam adversarii nostri prorsus enervarunt, quantum maxime possumus, revocare: et omnem vitæ licentiam, et dissolutionem morum, priscis et avitis legibus, et ea qua par est, quaque possumus severitate vindicare: nos regnorum statum, eo, quo accepimus, loco, sine imminutione ulla, aut mutatione retinere: et principibus nostris majestatem, quantum maxime possumus, incolumem conservare: nos ab illa ecclesia, quam isti speluncam latronum fecerant, et in qua nihil integrum, aut ecclesiæ simile reliquerant, quamque ipsi fatebantur multis in rebus erravisse, ut Lothum olim e Sodoma, aut Abrahamum e Chaldæa, non contentionis studio, sed Dei ipsius admonitu discessisse: et ex sacris libris, quos scimus non posse fallere, certam quandam religionis formam quæsisse, et ad veterum patrum, atque apostolorum primitivam ecclesiam, hoc est, ad primordia atque initia, tanquam ad fontes rediisse. Auctoritatem autem in ea re, aut consensum concilii Tridentini (in quo videremus nihil recte, atque ordine geri, ubi ab omnibus in unius nomen juraretur, ubi legati principum nostrorum contemnerentur, ubi nemo nostrorum theologorum audiretur, ubi aperte partibus atque ambitioni studeretur) non expectasse: sed quod olim sancti patres, quodque majores nostri sæpe fecerunt, provinciali conventu nostras ecclesias restituisse: episcopi vero Romani (cui obstricti non eramus, quique nihil habebat nec Christi, nec Petri, nec apostoli, nec omnino episcopi simile) jugum et tyrannidem, pro eo, ac debuimus, excussisse. Postremo, nos inter nos, de omnibus dogmatibus et capitibus religionis Christianæ convenire, et uno ore, unoque spiritu colere Deum, et Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

Quare, Christiane ac pie lector, cum videas rationes et causas, et restitutæ apud nos religionis, et secessionis ab istis nostræ: mirari non debes, si Christo nostro obtemperare maluimus, quam hominibus. Paulus nos admonuit, ne variis istis doctrinis nos abduci pateremur: utque illos imprimis fugeremus, qui sererent dissensiones præter illam doctrinam quam a Christo et apostolis acceperant. Jamdudum, ut noctua ad orientem solem, ita istorum imposturæ dilabuntur, et fugiunt ad aspectum, et lucem evangelii: et quamvis ad cælum usque exstructæ atque exaggeratæ sint; tamen levi momento, et quodammodo sua sponte corruunt. Non enim putare debes ista omnia temere, aut casu accidisse. Dei hæc voluntas fuit, ut invitis prope omnibus, evangelium Jesu Christi in orbem terrarum his temporibus spargeretur. Itaque divinis vocibus admoniti homines sese ultro ad Christi doctrinam contulerunt.

Nos quidem non gloriam ex ea re quæsimus, non opes, non voluptates, non otium. Hæc enim isti habent abunde omnia: et nos ea, cum apud illos essemus, multo largius et prolixius habebamus. Neque nos consensionem et pacem fugimus: sed pacis humanæ causa, cum Deo belligerari nolumus. Dulce quidem, inquit Hilarius, est nomen pacis: sed aliud est, inquit, pax; aliud servitus. Nam ut (quod isti quærunt) Christus tacere jubeatur: ut prodatur veritas evangelii: ut errores nefarii dissimulentur: ut Christianorum hominum oculis imponatur: ut in Deum aperte conspiretur, non ea pax est, sed iniquissima pactio servitutis. Est quædam, inquit Nazianzenus, pax inutilis: est quoddam utile dissidium. Nam paci cum exceptione studendum est, quantum fas sit, quantumque liceat: alioqui Christus ipse non pacem in mundum attulit, sed gladium. Quare si nos papa secum in gratiam redire velit, ipse prius in gratiam redire debet cum Deo. Hinc enim, inquit Cyprianus, schismata oriuntur, quia caput non quæritur, et ad fontem sacrarum scripturarum non reditur: et cœlestis magistri præcepta non servantur. Non enim, inquit, pax ea est, sed bellum: nec ecclesiæ jungitur, qui ab evangelio separatur. Isti vero cauponari tantum

[PART.
VI.]

solent nomen pacis. Pax enim illa quam tantopere quærunt, otiosorum tantum est ventrum tranquillitas. Nam hæc omnia inter nos facile componi possent, nisi ambitio, venter, luxus impedirent: hinc illæ lacrymæ; animus est in patinis. Id scilicet clamant, atque obstrepunt, ut male parta fœdius et nequius tueantur. Queruntur hodie de nobis indulgentiarii, datarii, quæstores, lenones, alique qui quæstum putant esse pietatem, nec Jesu Christo serviunt, sed suo ventri. Olim enim isti generi hominum fuit quæstus uberimus apud sæculum prius. Nunc autem quicquid Christo accedit, id omne sibi detractum putant. Id hodie pontifex ipse queritur, refrixisse, videlicet, pietatem: redditus suos angustiores jam esse, quam solebant. Itaque nos in odium rapit, quantum potest, et onerat contumeliis, et condemnat pro hæreticis: ut qui causam non intelligunt, putent, nullos esse homines nequiores. Nos tamen interim ea causa nec pudet, nec certe pudere debet, evangelii: Dei enim gloriam pluris facimus, quam existimationem hominum. Scimus ista vera esse omnia, quæ docemus: nec possumus aut vim facere conscientiæ nostræ, aut testimonium dicere contra Deum. Nam si nos negamus³¹ partem aliquam evangelii Jesu Christi coram hominibus, ille nos vicissim negabit coram Patre suo. Quod si qui sunt, qui offendi velint, et Christi doctrinam non ferant; cæci sunt, et duces cæcorum: veritas tamen prædicanda, et præ nobis ferenda est, et patienter expectandum est tribunal Dei.

Interim isti videant, quid agant, et de salute sua cogitent, et desinant odisse ac³² persequi evangelium Filii Dei, ne illum aliquando sentiant vindicem, et ultorem causæ suæ. Deus se haberi ludibrio non sinet. Jamdudum homines vident, quid agatur. Ista flamma, quanto magis reprimitur, tanto magis magisque crumpit, atque evolat. Infidelitas istorum non frustrabitur fidem Dei. Quod si duritiam istam animorum ponere, et Christi evangelium recipere recusabunt: publicani, et peccatores antevertent illis in regno Dei.

³¹ Matt. x. 33.³² Alit. *atque*.

Deus, et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi illis omnibus oculos aperiat, ut videre possint beatam illam spem, ad quam vocati sunt: ut una omnes glorificemus unum illum et verum Deum, cumque quem de cœlo ad nos demisit, Jesum Christum: cui una cum Patre, et Sancto Spiritu, reddatur omnis honor, et gloria in omnem æternitatem. Amen.

L O N D I N I :

Apud REGINALDUM WOLFIIUM,

Anno Domini

1567.

A D E F E N C E

OF THE

APOLOGY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND;

CONTAINING

AN ANSWER TO A CERTAIN BOOK LATELY SET
FORTH BY M. HARDING, AND ENTITLED,
“A CONFUTATION OF,” &c.

WHEREUNTO THERE IS ALSO NEWLY ADDED

An Answer unto another like book, written by the said M. Harding,
entituled, “A Detection of Sundry Foul Errors,” &c. Printed at
Lovain, anno 1568. and inserted into the former Answer, as
occasion and place required, as by special notes added
to the margin it may appear.

BY JOHN JEWEL,

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

3 ESDR. iv.

Magna est veritas et prævalet.

Great is the truth and prevaieth.

[This edition of the Defence of the Apology in passing through the press has been collated with the edition of 1570 "imprinted by Henry Wykes," which contained the last corrections of the Author.]

To the most virtuous and noble princess, queen Elizabeth, by the grace of God, queen of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c.

IT had been greatly to be wished, most gracious sovereign] lady, that, as God of his mercy hath given us, ever since the first time of your majesty's most happy government, such success in all civil affairs, such concord and quietness in all estates, as our fathers seldom have seen before: so our hearts with like felicity might thoroughly have consented in the profession of one undoubted truth, and all our wills, which now are so violently rent asunder and so far distracted, might fully have joined together in the will of God: that all quarrels and contentions set apart, we might with one mouth and one mind glorify God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Howbeit, it appeareth by the continual story and whole discourse of the holy scriptures, that Almighty God, of his deep judgments and secret providence, suffereth some men oftentimes to delight in darkness, to withstand the gospel, to seek occasions, and wilfully to set themselves against the knowledge and truth of God. I write not this, most gracious lady, to the intent to make them odious in your majesty's sight, that this day are the procurers of all these troubles. God is able even of the hard unsensible stones to raise up children unto Abraham, and to make them the vessels of his mercy. Nevertheless, as St. Paul teacheth us, such men there have 1 Tim. iv. been in times past, that have had their consciences burnt with hot irons, speaking and maintaining lies in hypocrisy; that have given themselves over into reprobate and wilful Rom. i. minds, and have despised the wisdom of God within themselves. And, notwithstanding such battles and dissensions,

specially in the church of God, which is called "the house of unity," be offensive and grievous unto the godly, and therefore work great hinderance unto the due passage of the gospel of Christ, yet in the end the trouble hereof in God's elect is recompensed abundantly with great advantage. For God's truth is mighty, and shall prevail: Dagon shall fall down headlong before the ark: the darkness shall flee before the light: and the more fiercely man's wisdom shall withstand, the more glorious shall God be in his victory.

But, shortly to discourse unto your majesty the particular occasions hereof from the beginning: after it had pleased Almighty God, at the first entry of your majesty's reign, by a most happy exchange, and by the means of your majesty's most godly travails, to restore unto us the light and comfort of his gospel, there was written and published by us a little book in the Latin tongue, entituled, "*An Apology of the Church of England,*" containing the whole substance of the catholic faith now professed and freely preached throughout all your majesty's dominions; that thereby all foreign nations might understand the considerations and causes of your majesty's doings in that behalf. Thus in old times did Quadratus, Melito, Justinus Martyr, Tertullian, and other godly and learned fathers, upon like occasions, as well to make known the truth of God, and to open the grounds of their profession, as also to put the infidels to silence, and to stop the mouths of the wicked.

This Apology being thus written first in Latin, and afterward, upon the comfortable report of your majesty's most godly enterprises, translated into sundry other tongues, and so made common to the most part of all Europe, as it hath been well allowed of and liked of the learned and godly, as it is plain by their open testimonies touching the same, so hath it not hitherto, for ought that may appear, been anywhere openly reprov'd either in Latin or otherwise, either by any one man's private writing, or by the public authority of any nation.

Only one M. Harding, not long sithence your majesty's subject, now misliking the present state, and resiant in

Louvain, hath of late taken upon him, against the said Apology, with the whole doctrine and all the parts of the same, to publish an open Confutation, and to offer the same unto your majesty : wherein he sheweth himself so vehement, and so sharp and busy in finding faults, that he doubteth not to seek quarrels against us, even in that we maintain the baptism of Christian infants, the proceeding and godhead of the Holy Ghost, the faith of the holy and glorious Trinity, and the general and catholic profession of the common creed. Thus, for that he hath once severed himself from us, he beareth now the world in hand we can believe nothing without an error. The main ground of his whole plea is this, That the bishop of Rome, whatsoever it shall like him to determine in judgment, can never err : that he is always undoubtedly possessed of God's Holy Spirit : that at his only hand we must learn to know the will of God : that in his only holiness standeth the unity and safety of the church : that whosoever is divided from him must be judged an heretic : and, that without the obedience of him there is no hope of salvation. And yet, as though it were not sufficient for him so vainly to soothe a man in open errors, he telleth us also sadly and in good earnest, that the same bishop is not only a bishop, but also a king : that unto him belongeth the authority and right of both swords, as well temporal as spiritual : that all kings and emperors receive their whole power at his hand, and ought to swear obedience and fealty unto him. For these be his words, even in this book so boldly dedicate unto your majesty : " It is a great eyesore," saith M. Harding, " to the ministers of Antichrist, to see the vicar of Christ above lords and kings of this world, and to see princes and emperors promise and swear obedience unto him." And whereas pope Zachary, by the consent or conspiracy of the nobles of France, deposed Chilperichus the true, natural, and liege prince of that realm, and placed Pipinus in his room, " Lo," saith M. Harding, " ye (must needs) confess, that this was a divine power in the pope : for otherwise he could never have done it." Thus

Conf. fol.
334. b.Conf. fol.
285. a.Conf. fol.
324. b.Conf. fol.
204. b.Conf. fol.
306. b.Conf. fol.
180. a. et 305.
b.Conf. fol.
247. b.Conf. fol.
248. b.Conf. fol.
178. b.Conf. fol.
178. b.Conf. fol.
182. a.

much he esteemeth the dishonours and overthrowes of God's anointed.

Whereas also pope Boniface the Eighth, for that he could not have the treasury of France at his commandment, endeavoured, with all his both ecclesiastical and worldly puissance, to remove Philip the French king from his estate, and, under his bulls or letters patents, had conveyed the same solemnly unto Albertus the king of Romans; M. Harding here telleth your majesty, that all this was very well done, "to the intent thereby to fray the king, and to keep him in awe, and to reclaim his mind from disobedience." Now, touching your majesty's most noble progenitors, the kings of this realm, whereas we, as our loyalty and allegiance bindeth us, justly complain, that pope Alexander the Third, by violence and tyranny, forced king Henry the Second to surrender his crown imperial into the hands of his legate, and afterward for a certain space to content himself in private estate, to the great indignation and grief of his loving subjects: and that likewise pope Innocentius the Third stirred up the nobles and commons of this realm against king John, and gave the inheritance and possession of all his dominions unto Ludovicus the French king, (as for the misusing of your majesty's most dear father of most noble memory, king Henry the Eighth, forasmuch as the smart thereof is yet in fresh remembrance, I will say nothing :) to these and all other like tyrannical injuries and just causes of grief, M. Harding shortly and in light manner thinketh it sufficient to answer thus: "What though king Henry the Second were ill-entreated of pope Alexander the Third? what though king John were ill-entreated of that zealous and learned pope Innocentius the Third? what though king Henry the Eighth were likewise entreated of the popes in our time?" I know right well, most sovereign lady, the goodness of your gracious nature delighteth not in such rehearsals. Neither do I make report hereof, for that such things sometimes have been done; but for that the same things even now at this time, either so lightly are excused, or so

Conf. fol.
182. b.

M. Harding
fol. 340. a.

boldly are defended. Such humble affection and obedience these men, by their open and public writings, teach your majesty's true subjects to bear towards their natural prince. It shall much warrant the honour and safety of your royal estate, if your majesty shall sometimes remember the dishonours and dangers that other your noble progenitors have felt before you.

But concerning the majesty and right of kings and emperors, M. Harding telleth us, "They have their first authority by the positive law of nations, and can have no more power than the people hath, of whom they take their temporal jurisdiction:" as if he would say, Emperors and kings have none other right of government, than it hath pleased their subjects by composition to allow unto them. Thus he saith, and saith it boldly; as if God himself had never said, *Per me reges regnant*: "By me and my authority, kings bear rule over their subjects:" or, as if Christ our Saviour had never said unto Pilate the lord lieutenant, "Thou shouldest have no power over me, were it not given thee from above:" or, as if St. Paul had not said, *Non est potestas, nisi a Deo*: "There is no power, but only from God." And yet further, as if their whole study were fully bent in respect of the pope, to deface the authority and majesty of all princes, even now one of the same company doubteth not to teach the world, "That the pope is the head, and kings and emperors are the feet³³." Like as also another of the same faction saith, "The emperor's majesty is so far inferior in dignity to the pope, as a creature is inferior unto God³⁴." We devise not these things of malice, most gracious lady, but report the same truly, as we find them proclaimed and published this day by their vain and dangerous writings, which notwithstanding they would so fain have to be taken as catholic. If this doctrine may once take root, and be freely received

M. Harding
fol. 318. b.

Prov. viii.

John xix.

Rom. xlii.

Dorman, fol.
15.

Stanislaus
Orichovius
in Chimæra,
fol. 97. [et
fol. 99.]

³³ [Dorman's expression is, "some others in place of feet to go, "some hands to work," &c.]

³⁴ [Orichovius. "Quantum
"Deus præstat sacerdoti, tantum

"sacerdos præstat regi," and fol. 99, "Quamobrem, qui regem anteponit sacerdoti, is anteponit creaturam creatori."]

amongst the subjects, it shall be hard for any prince to hold his right. As for your majesty, for that it hath pleased Almighty God in his mercy to make you an instrument of his glory, as in old times he made many other godly and noble princes, to reform his church from that huge and loathsome heap of filth and rubbish, that either by violence or by negligence had been thrown into it: therefore M. Harding even in this selfsame book, under certain general threats, chargeth you with disordered presumption, by the example of Ozias the wicked king, "upon whom," as he saith, "God sent his vengeance for the like." For be the abuses and errors of the church never so many, be the falls and dangers never so great, be the priests and bishops never so blind, yet by this doctrine it may never be lawful for the prince, be he never so learned, or so wise, or so zealous in God's cause, to attempt any manner of reformation. And therefore thus he saith unto your majesty, and with all his skill and cunning laboureth to persuade your majesty's subjects, if any one or other haply of simplicity will believe him, that the godly laws, which your majesty hath given us to live under, are no laws: that your parliaments are no parliaments: that your clergy is no clergy: our sacraments no sacraments: our faith no faith. The church of England, whereof your majesty is the most principal and chief, he calleth "a malignant church," "a new church erected by the devil," "a Babylonical tower," "a herd of Antichrist," "a temple of Lucifer," "a synagogue and a school of Satan, full of robbery, sacrilege, schism, and heresy." And all this he furnisheth with such liberty of other uncourteous and unseemly talks, as if he had been purposely hired to speak dishonour of your majesty's most godly doings.

Of all these and other like tragical phantasies, forasmuch as he hath so boldly adventured to make a present unto your majesty, we have great cause to rejoice in God, for that our controversies are brought to be debated before such a personage as is able so well and so deeply to understand them. For I have no doubt, but, as by your great learning and marvellous wisdom you shall soon see the

M. Harding
fol. 298. a.

Confut. 277.

Confut. 328.

a.

Confut. 172.

b.

Rejoind. 314.

Confut. 87. a.

Confut. 269.

b.

Rejoind. 42.

a.

Confut. 43. a.

Confut. 269.

a. 323. b.

334. a. 338. a.

348. b.

difference of our pleadings: so of your majesty's gracious inclination unto all godliness you will readily find out the falsehood, and give sentence with the truth. Verily, after that your majesty shall have thoroughly considered the manifest untruths and corruptions, together with the abuses and errors of the contrary side, the weakness of the cause, the boldness of the man, and the immoderate bitterness of his speech; I have good hope, the more advisedly you shall behold it, the less cause you shall find wherefore to like it. For the discovery hereof, for my poor portion of learning, I have endeavoured to do that I was able: and the same here I humbly present unto your majesty, as unto my most gracious and sovereign liege lady, and, as now, the only nurse and mother of the church of God within these your majesty's most noble dominions. It may please your majesty graciously to weigh it, and to judge of it, not according to the skill and ability of the writer, which is but simple, but according to the weight and worthiness of the cause. The poor labours have been mine: the cause is God's. The goodness of the one will be always able to countervail the simplicity of the other. ✓

God evermore inflame and direct your majesty with his Holy Spirit, that the zeal of his house may thoroughly devour your gracious heart: that you may safely walk in the ways of your father David: that you may utterly abandon all groves and hill altars: that you may live an old mother in Israel: that you may see an end of all dissensions, and establish peace and unity in the church of God. *Amen.* ✓

Your majesty's most humble subject
and faithful orator,

JOHN SALISBURY.

A

PREFACE TO THE READER,

CONTAINING THE

CAUSES OF THIS NEW IMPRESSION³⁵.

GOOD Christian reader, I doubt not, but the very title and first entry of M. Harding's last book is sufficient to astonne thy senses. For thus he beginneth: "A Detection of Lies, Cavils, Slanders," &c. as if Hercules Furens or Ajax Mastigophorus were newly turned into English. If I should quit him, either with number of books or with courtesy of speech, I should be like unto him, and encumber the world with needless labours. Wherefore being moved eftsoons to print my late book, entituled, "The Defence of the Apology of the Church of England," I thought it good by a short augmentation, to discharge all such quarrels as M. Harding in his said Detection hath moved against certain parcels of the same: and therein to use such temperance of words, not as may best answer M. Harding's eloquence, but as may be comely for the cause.

Now if thou shalt vouchsafe to examine our doings, I beseech thee to judge uprightly, and not to suffer thyself by shows and shifts to be beguiled. What man would seem to deal so plainly as a juggler? He will strike up

³⁵ [This Preface first appeared in the edition of 1570.]

his sleeves, and make bare his arms, and open his hands and fingers, and lay all things before thee, and bid thee behold: and thou wilt think him to be a good plain man, and marvel that thou shouldest possibly be deceived. And yet indeed his whole skill and seeking is nothing else, but to deceive thee: and the more simply and plainly he would seem to deal, so much the sooner he will deceive thee: otherwise he were no juggler. Thou shalt think thou seest all, and yet seest nothing. Thou shalt think thou feelest it sensibly with thy fingers, that thou holdest it fast, and canst not lose it: and yet shalt thou open thy hands, and find nothing. So easy a thing it is to inveigle thy senses.

When thou hearest a counsellor pleading for his client at the bar, perhaps thou wilt think it is all law that he speaketh, and that the case is plain, and nothing to be said to the contrary. But when another counsellor shall stand forth and reply against him, and rip up his tale, and weigh his reasons, and disclose the errors and weakness of his pleading, then wilt thou begin to mislike that thou likedst before, and wonder at thine own simplicity, that ever thou wert so fond to believe the former. Yea the judge himself, notwithstanding, upon some good likelihood of the cause, he be inclined to favour the one side, yet sometimes, by weight and force of better reason, he changeth his opinion, and giveth sentence with the other. There is great darkness in man's wisdom. Oftentimes it is true, that we take to be false. Our phantasy is no right measure of God's causes.

But M. Harding telleth thee that I "falsify all that I take in hand;" that I forge and counterfeit, and leave out, either the beginning, or the middle, or the end, and report nothing as I find it: briefly, that all my writings are fraught with lies. It is no hard matter for M. Harding thus to say. It were more marvel if he would say otherwise. Chrysostum saith: *Qui mendax est, neminem* ² *putat verum dicere*..... He is a party, and would be loth to yield to any thing against himself.

For thy better satisfaction in these cases, good reader,

² Chrysost.
[Opus Im-
perf.] in
Matth. hom.
19. [vi. ap-
pend. p. 97.
col. 1.]

I have here laid forth before thee a few such examples, as wherein M. Harding would seem to have found most advantage. This have I done in as few words, and as briefly, as the cause would bear : and yet, I trust, so openly and so plainly, that thou mayest easily see the truth and uprightness of his dealing. And although perhaps thou be his friend, and for some particular affection wish favourably unto his side, yet I will not refuse to make thee judge between us both.

First therefore to begin with that thing, whereof M. Harding and certain his well-willers have made greatest triumph : where I say, that one Euppsychius, being within holy orders, and the bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, married a wife, and shortly after, being as yet but newly married, was put to death for the name of Christ, and died a martyr, M. Harding hereunto answereth thus : “ M. Jewel most falsely corrupteth the reporter of this story.....Behold the falsehood of this man :.....Sozomenus nameth him : *Εὐψύχιον Καισαρέα Καππάδοκον τῶν ἐκπατριδῶν* : as much as, ‘ Euppsychius, one of the lords, or one of the nobility of the city of Cæsarea in Cappadocia.’ M. Jewel was so bold to falsify the place, and to put in of his own this word, *episcopum*, to help his matter. Thus he taketh upon him to make him a bishop who was a layman, as well a bishop as he himself is,” &c. Herein therefore, good reader, standeth the strife. I say, Euppsychius was a bishop : M. Harding saith, he was a mere layman, and no bishop. The issue is this, Whether this Euppsychius were a bishop or no. And as thou shalt find him true herein, so mayest thou trust him in the rest. First, in the second Council of Nice, this selfsame Euppsychius is called *Euppsychius presbyter Cæsareæ* : “ Euppsychius, a priest of the church of Cæsarea.” Here mayest thou see, that Euppsychius was a priest, that is, I trow, somewhat more than a mere layman, and in some possibility to be a bishop, all M. Harding’s waste words, of lords and noblemen, notwithstanding. If this authority suffice him not, let him further be advised by that ancient and godly learned father Athanasius, whom Socrates called the great star of Egypt. He will tell him

M. Harding
in Præfat. ad
Lector.
****iii.

Con. Nicen.
2. act. 6. p.
581. [Mansi,
xiii. 317.]

Socrat. lib. 4.
cap. 23. [ii.
241.]

by plain words, that Euppsychius, and this selfsame Euppsychius, in very deed was a bishop. Thus he saith of him : *Scripta Leontii et Euppsychii, episcoporum Cappadociæ* : Athanas. in Oratone 1. contra Arianos. [i. 278.] "The writings of Leontius and Euppsychius, bishops of the kingdom of Cappadocia³⁶." Mark, good reader, and tell M. Harding, Athanasius saith not, Euppsychius the "lord or nobleman," but Euppsychius "the bishop." He was the bishop of Cæsarea : and Cæsarea was the chief city of Cappadocia. This is plain dealing. I lead thee not about, as M. Harding doth, with conjectures and guesses. I shew thee by express and plain words, that Euppsychius was a bishop, and that I prove by sufficient authority of ancient fathers. Here thou hast the same country Cappadocia, the same city of Cæsarea, the same time of persecution under Julianus Apostata, the same man, the same martyr, and the same name. If this be true, as indeed it is, what mayest thou then think of M. Harding, that saith, It is false ? what mayest thou then think of him that so boldly telleth thee, that this Euppsychius was never, neither bishop of Cæsarea, nor of any other place else, no not so much as a priest, or deacon, or subdeacon ? what mayest thou then think of him, that blusheth not thus vainly to blot his papers, and thus to tell the world, "M. Jewel hath fathered a shameful lie upon Cassiodorus : M. Jewel hath belied and falsified Sozomenus and his translator ?" what mayest thou then think of him, that so impatiently crieth out without cause, "Fie upon such shameless liars : O lamentable state, where the people of God is compelled to hear such prophets ?" It were better for M. Harding to be wise and sober, than thus to fare.

Whereas against the inordinate ambition and pride of the bishops of Rome, I allege these words out of the book called *Opus Imperfectum*, bearing the name of Chrysostom, "Whoso desireth primacy in earth, shall in heaven find confusion," M. Harding answereth : "These words are not, neither in *Opere Imperfecto*, nor in any other book of Chrysostom : Chrysostom hath no such saying : it is a for-

³⁶ [In the Bened. ed. the title of this work of St. Athanasius is "Epistola ad Episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ."]

M. Harding,
Detect. fol.
302. a.

M. Harding,
Detect. fol.
185. a.

gery, and that you know well enough: yet ye are not ashamed to deceive the ignorant." Here have we a very peremptory negative boldly presumed. And a man would think, that a doctor of divinity would not so stoutly warrant a matter, unless he knew it. For so perhaps he might be found ignorant, and be deceived. But, good reader, if thou happen at any time to have access unto him, I beseech thee, even as thou hast affiance in his word, and tenderest his credit, desire him to open his book, called *Opus Imperfectum*, and to turn to the five and thirtieth homily of the same. There shalt thou find these selfsame words which he so constantly telleth thee can never be found in all the world: *Quicumque desideraverit [desideret] primum in terra, inveniet in cælo confusionem*: "Whosoever ambitiously desireth primacy in earth, he in heaven shall find confusion." These words, I say, M. Harding shall find, not only in his own Gratian, which thing unto him had been sufficient, but also in the author himself. Ask him therefore, what he meant, so out of season to talk of forgery. Ask him, what so heinous offence M. Jewel hath committed herein, whereof he ought to be ashamed.

Where, I say, pope Zosimus, the better to maintain his ambitious claim, corrupted the holy council of Nice, M. Harding answereth: "Never did any honest man say so from the beginning of the world." Good reader, I beseech thee even for the truth's sake, hearken advisedly what I shall say. The case is clear: thus it standeth: About eleven hundred years ago pope Zosimus began to claim superiority and jurisdiction over all the churches and bishops of Africa. The bishops of that country, to the number of two hundred and seventeen, assembled together in the African council, misliked the strangeness of his attempt, and openly refused him, and told him plainly, They knew of no such authority that he had over them. Pope Zosimus for his warrant alleged a decree or canon, that he himself, or some other his predecessor, had forged under the name of the council of Nice. The bishops answered him, that they themselves also had copies of the same Nicene council: but any such canon, touching such superiority of

³
Chrysost. in
Opere Im-
perfecto,
hom. 35. [vi.
app. 153. col.
1.]
Distinct. 40.
Multi.

⁴
M. Harding,
Detect. fol.
249. a.

the pope, they found none there. The pope said their copies were corrupted : and they said the like of the pope's. For trial of the matter, they agreed together to send unto the most famous churches of all the east, unto Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch : and from thence they received the true copies of the Greek originals, under the authentical seals of the patriarchs there. By conference whereof it was evident unto all the world, that the pope's only copy disagreed from all the rest, and was foully corrupted to serve his turn : and so consequently, that the "pope was a falsifier, and a forger of councils." Thus standeth the very true story of this whole matter, as it is evident by the council of Africa.

And therefore Marcus the archbishop of Ephesus, together with Josephus the patriarch of Constantinople, Bessarion the archbishop of Nice, and Isidorus the metropolitan of Syria, with others mo, archbishops and metropolitans of great provinces and countries, and a great number of other inferior bishops, said thus openly in the late council of Florence, by way of protestation against the pope : *Nonne vides, reverende pater, summum pontificem (Zosimum) falsum decretum, et non in synodo promulgatum, ad tantum concilium pro re tam magna misisse ?* "And see you not, reverend father, that pope Zosimus, being then the highest bishop, for a matter of great weight, sent unto that worthy council of Africa, a false, or a falsified canon, such as never was published in the council of Nice ?" Bid M. Harding mark well these words. "This canon," say they, "is false and falsified : and such as never was decreed in the council of Nice." As if they would say, "Will you bear us down, or advance your authority by this canon ? It is well known to be a forgery." What can there be more plainly spoken ? They say expressly, even as we say, This new canon was forged and falsified, and that either by pope Zosimus, or by some other pope his predecessor. And yet can M. Harding so sadly tell us, "That never honest man said so from the beginning of the world ?" or can he make us believe, that all these metropolitans, archbishops, and patriarchs in the council of Florence, and of the other two

Council. African. can. 102, 103. [vi. §13.] In Græco. p. 82.

Council. Floren. sess. 20. [xxxii. 773. d. e.]

hundred and seventeen bishops in the council of Africa, among whom was Alypius and St. Augustine, there was not one honest man? D. Tonsal, in his sermon pronounced openly before king Henry, disclosed and reprov'd the same falsehood. Likewise doctor Redman in open writing acknowledged and confessed the same: yet were they not dishonest men.

Whereas I say, It was specially provided by the council of Carthage, that the bishop of Rome should not be called the universal bishop, *Ne Romanus episcopus appelletur universalis*, M. Harding answereth: "A shameless man: an impudent glosser: three impudent lies: these be not the words of the council of Carthage: they are to be referred to the third part of the Distinction, that followeth afterward." If these be not the words of the council of Carthage, yet at least they are Gratian's words, reporting the words of the council of Carthage. Verily, whose words soever it shall please M. Harding to make them, by his own confession, they are none of mine. The words be plain: *Universalis autem nec etiam Romanus episcopus appelletur*: "Let not the bishop of Rome himself be called the 'universal bishop.'" And this, saith M. Harding, is the very meaning of pope Pelagius, that followeth next afterward in the same Distinction. Now if these be the express and plain words of Gratian: if they be eftsoons uttered and confirmed by the Gloss: if by implication and meaning they be the words of the council of Carthage and of pope Pelagius: to be short, if they be no words of mine: was not then M. Harding well occupied so vainly to cry out, "Three impudent lies: a shameless man: an impudent glosser?" A sober man would be better advised what he speaketh.

Where I say pope Liberius was an Arian heretic, M. Harding answereth, "or else ye are an errant slanderous liar." Judge thou between us indifferently, good Christian reader: and let the liar have his meed. This is not my judgment of pope Liberius: it is written and reported by sundry others, even by such as M. Harding may not justly condemn for "errant liars." Here will I speak

M. Harding
fol. 190. b.
191. a.

Dist. 99.
Primæ.

M. Harding,
fol. 249. b.

nothing of St. Hierom. For M. Harding utterly refuseth his judgment in this behalf, and saith, he was much deceived. Howbeit, "errant liar," I trow, he will not call him, for his authority's sake. But Sabellicus saith: *Liberius, ut quidam scribunt, ex confesso factus est Arianus*: "Pope Liberius, as some men say, by open profession became an Arian." Alphonsus de Castro saith in plain words: *De Liberio papa constat, [l. Platina refert] fuisse Arianum*: "As for pope Liberius, it is well known, he was an Arian heretic." The same is avouched by Rhelgino, by Platina, by cardinal Cusanus, by Anselmus Rid, and by others, as afterward it shall be alleged in place convenient more at large. All these, and others mo, have reported, that pope Liberius was an heretic. Therefore, good reader, bid M. Harding to be better advised, what, and how many they be, whom he so rashly condemneth for "errant liars."

M. Harding's
Confut. par.
6. cap. 5.
dist. 2.

Sabel. Enn.
7. lib. 8.

Alphonsus
contra Hæ-
res. lib. 1.
cap. 4. [p.
20.]

Whereas I say, "pope Cœlestinus was a Nestorian heretic," M. Harding answereth, "Who ever heard such an impudent man? a most impudent liar: a wicked slanderer." All this vain wind is soon blown over. Laurentius Valla, a canon of the church of Rome, saith thus: *Papa Cælestinus sensit cum hæretico Nestorio*: "Pope Cœlestinus agreed in judgment with the heretic Nestorius." Now judge thou, good Christian reader, who is "impudent," and who is "a liar." And bid M. Harding to construe these words, and to be better assured before he speak. For rash judgment argueth some folly.

M. Harding's
Detect. fol.
253 b.

Laurent. Vall.
de Donatione
Constant.
[p. 16.]

Where I say pope, Bonifacius II. condemned St. Augustine, and all the whole council of Africa, and said, they were all led by the devil, for that they withstood the ambition of the church of Rome, M. Harding answereth, "Here is Bonifacius II. foully belied: it is an impudent lie: this man is not ashamed to lie. Pope Bonifacius II. never condemned St. Augustine by name, nor the council of Africa by any solemn sentence." A man would think, so many great words should bear some weight. How solemn the pope was in his sentence, it forceth not greatly. Certain it is he condemned Aurelius the bishop of Car-

M. Harding's
Detect. fol.
172 a.

thage, with all others his fellow-bishops, and said, they were all enticed and led by the devil : and one of his said fellow-bishops was St. Augustine the bishop of Hippo, as it is most evident by the subscription of the council of Africa. The words of the said pope Bonifacius be these : *Aurelius Carthaginensis ecclesiæ olim episcopus, cum collegis suis, instigante diabolo, superbire cœpit contra Romanam ecclesiam*³⁶. Therefore, good reader, once again thou mayest tell M. Harding, that pope Bonifacius the Second indeed and undoubtedly condemned St. Augustine, and said, "He was led by the devil," only for that he would not yield to his predecessors' ambitious folly. This is neither impudency nor lie, but manifest truth.

Whereas I say, your fathers in the council of Basil, and your friends in the late council of Trident³⁷, yielded and gave place to the Bohemians, and unto such others as you call heretics, M. Harding answereth : "This lie is so clear and so evident, that our confutation is needless." Whether this lie be so clear and so evident as here it is told us, or whether it be any lie at all, let M. Harding himself be the judge. In the council of Basil it is written thus : *Indultum liberationis [et] communionis sub utraque specie* : "The grant of delivering the communion under both kinds." The like thing M. Harding might have found recorded by cardinal Cusanus, that was present at the council of Basil. For thus he writeth to the Bohemians : *Scribitis, nos compactiones ignorare* : "Ye say, that we know not the agreement or composition." Where also he expressly maketh mention of that parcel of the agreement, wherein the liberty of the "communion under both kinds" was contained : and called it *caput de libertate communionis*. Ask therefore M. Harding, what clear eyes he had to see this lie to be so evident.

³⁶ [It will be remembered, that although the forged Decretal epistles were many of them suspected in Jewel's time, yet the imposture had not been fully exposed.]

³⁷ [Trent. Harding in his Detection complains that Jewel has answered *nothing* about his alleg-

ing the Council of Trent. But the bishop might have answered, as he doubtless meant, that in a Decree published in the 6th Session, the council so far yielded, as to refer the question to the pope. See Martin. Chemnitii Examen Concil. Trident. p. 331.]

Bonif. II.
Epist. ad En-
thalium.
[Pseudo.
Isidor. Man-
si, viii. 732.]

M. Harding,
fol. 98 a.

Concil. tom.
3.
In Append.
Con. Basil.
p. 243. [Man-
si, xxix. 413
b.]
Hæc San-
ctus.

Nicol. Cusan.
ad Bohemos,
epist. 6. [p.
850.]

Where I say, "The gospel was preached in this realm, either, as Theodoretus saith, by St. Paul the apostle, passing this way into Spain, or by Simon Zelotes, as saith Nicephorus," M. Harding answereth, "Here M. Jewel extremely beliieth Theodoretus and Nicephorus." Good reader, notwithstanding the report hereof were untrue, yet, as thou seest, it containeth not any such extremity, or horror of lying. Whether St. Paul were here or no, it is no article of our faith. We may well either receive it, or refuse it without danger. It were great folly, to be over earnest in so small a matter.

Howbeit, touching St. Paul's being and preaching within this realm, three learned men of our time, Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Johannes Wigandus, and Matthæus Judex have written thus: *Theodoretus libro nono de curandis Græcorum affectibus indicat, Paulum e priori captivitate Roma dimissum, Britannis, et aliis in occidente, evangelium prædicasse. Idem fere tradit Sophronius Hierosolymitanus patriarcha*: "Theodoretus in his ninth book, *De Curandis Græcorum Affectibus*, sheweth us, that St. Paul being set at liberty after his first imprisonment in Rome, preached the gospel to the people of the island of Britain," (now called England,) "and to other nations of the west³⁸." But perhaps M. Harding will yield small credit to these three men, notwithstanding their learning. Therefore, for his better satisfaction, may it like him rather to believe Theodoretus himself. These be his words: *Nostrī illi piscatores, et publicani, sutorque ille noster (Paulus) cunctis nationibus legem evangelicam detulerunt. Neque solum Romanos, quique sub Romano vivunt imperio, sed Scythas quoque et Sauromatas, Indos præterea, Æthiopes, Persas, Seras, Hyrcanos, Britannos, Cimmerios, et Germanos, utque semel dicam, omne hominum genus, nationesque omnes induxerunt Crucifixi leges accipere*: "Our fishers, and publicans, (that were the apostles,) and our cobbler (St. Paul), carried the law of the gospel to all nations. And they forced, not only the Romans, and others living under the Roman

M. Harding,
fol. 83 b.

[Cent. Mag.]
Centur. 1.
lib. 2. cap. 2.

[Theodoret.
de Cur. Gr.
Aff. ed. Gaisf.
p. 341.]

³⁸ [See vol. ii. p. 29, note ¹³, also pp. 74, 75.]

empire, but also the Tartarians, the Samaritans or Polonians, the Indians, the Ethiopians, the Persians, the Serians, the Hyrcanians, the people of Britain," (now called England,) "the Cimmerians, and the Germans, and to be short, all kinds and nations of men to receive the laws of Christ crucified." Here have we the people of Britain: here have we St. Paul the apostle, whom Theodoretus calleth a

Acts xvlij. 3. "cobbler," for that by his occupation he sewed skins together to make tents. I see what may be M. Harding's answer. But if he will say, St. Paul came never into this land, then let him tell us, what other of the apostles came ever hither. For that one of them came hither, and here preached the gospel, by Theodoretus' words it seemeth evident.

Niceph. lib.
2. cap. 40. [1.
202.]

Touching Simon Zelotes, Nicephorus saith thus: *Simon Zelotes doctrinam evangelii ad occidentalium oceanum insulasque Britannicas perfert.* Therefore, for M. Harding so vainly and so uncivilly to cry out in so light a matter without cause, I will not call it "extreme lying:" but verily some man may well call it "extreme folly."

M. Harding,
fol. 256 b.

Whereas I say, pope Hildebrand, as he was charged by the council of Brixia, was an advouterer, a church-robber, a perjured man, a man-killer, a sorcerer, and a renegade of the faith, M. Harding answereth, "I know that you lie, I may say it saving my charity, rather than your worship. For pope Hildebrand was a very holy man. You shall find yourself a liar, and pope Hildebrand a virtuous man." Mark this thing, I beseech thee, good reader: In all this whole place, touching pope Hildebrand, I allege not one word of mine own: but only report the words of the council of Brixia. Be the report of the council true or false, certainly my report is true. For I report only that I find. The council in most plain wise calleth pope Hildebrand

Abbas Urs-per. [in A.D. 1080.] *virum procacissimum, sacrilegia, et incendia prædicantem, perjuriam, et homicidia defendentem:.....hæretici Berengarii antiquum discipulum, divinationum et insomniorum cultorem, manifestum necromanticum, Pythonico spiritu laborantem, et a vera fide exorbitantem.* If thou doubt the

credit of this council, Nauclerus, Lambertus Scaphnaburgensis, Anselmus Rid, Sigebertus Gemblacensis, and others have confirmed the same.

Nauclerus hereof writeth thus: "The clergy said, that pope Hildebrand had defiled the apostolic see with simony, heresy, murder, and advoutery: that he was a renegade, and had forsaken the faith of Christ: and that therefore he was for good causes and justly excommunicate by all the bishops of Italy."

Sigebertus Gemblacensis saith: "Pope Hildebrand in his time troubled all the states of Christendom; and, for his outrage and cruelty being banished and driven out of Rome, in the end when he saw death approach, he made his confession to one of his cardinals, that he had abused his pastoral office, and that he had troubled mankind with malice and mischief, by the counsel and procurement of the devil."

All this notwithstanding, M. Harding saith, "Pope Hildebrand was a very virtuous, and a holy man:" and so constantly telleth us, "I know that you lie: you shall find yourself to be a liar."

Whereas I allege a dialogue of Anselmus, sometime archbishop of Canterbury, to prove, that in his time it was not thought unlawful for priests to marry, their holy orders notwithstanding, M. Harding answereth: "This is none of Anselm's dialogues: it is a riffraff: it is a forgery: I will not call it plain lying." Good reader, here M. Harding over boldly presumeth, as his wont is, before he know. If he knew more, he would say less. Indeed it is one of Anselm's dialogues. I have seen it, and read it in authentical copies: as otherwhere I have proved more at large. And the words of the said dialogue are even as I have alleged them. *Desideramus certificari tua solutione, super vulgari toto orbe questione, quæ ab omnibus pene quotidie ventilatur, et adhuc his celatur indiscussa, an liceat presbyteris post acceptum ordinem uxores ducere:* "Whether it be lawful for priests being in orders to marry wives, or no." And this question, saith he, at that time, that is to say, in the days of king Henry the First, was beaten and disputed

Nauclerus
Generatio.
36. [leg. 37.]

Sigebertus
Gemblacen-
sis, Sc, sua-
dente diabolo,
contra hu-
manum ge-
nus odium
et iram con-
citasse.

M. Harding.
fol. 308 a. b.

Pagina 564
et 565. [ed.
1570. 5th pt.
cap. 3. div.
8.]

Ann. Dom.
1109.

throughout the whole world, and yet lay still undiscussed. If M. Harding had been better informed, he would not have called this either ruffraff, or plain lying. But oftentimes he is hardiest man to speak, that hath least to say.

Last of all, whereas I allege an authority of Damasus, taken out of Gratian, to prove that sundry popes were priests' sons, "Oh," saith M. Harding, "who ever saw so impudent a man! what shall I say to this fellow? Fie, for shame, man. A minister of fables: a minister of lies: foolish ignorance: shameless malice: so ignorant: so witless: how could Damasus write of so many popes so long to come after his death?"

6 So terrible is M. Harding in his dealing. But be not afraid, good reader, of all this smoke. Thou shalt see it suddenly blown all to vanity, from whence it came. First of all, as touching the very truth of the story, every of these popes by Gratian alleged was indeed a priest's son. And this only was it I had to say. And now the same I say again: Every of these popes was a priest's son, not one excepted, as in place it shall be proved. What cause then had M. Harding so vainly to disquiet himself, and thus to cry out upon poor ministers, of lies and fables? That I say is true: and truth is no lie: truth is no fable.

But you will say, Damasus was dead long before these popes were born: how then could he know who were their fathers? Herein I grant, there is an error. But, good reader, it is Gratian's error: it is not mine. I report Gratian only as I find him. I put not to him: I take not from him. I alter not one letter of all his words. Therefore tell M. Harding, it is Gratian his own doctor and dearling, that thus hath written. Bid him call Gratian ignorant, foolish, shameless, and witless, and what him listeth, and let him not spare. Let him hardly strike him that did him hurt. For M. Harding hath told us other-
wheres, that whoso striketh one man for another, is but a fool.

Thus, good Christian reader, thou seest one whole jury of M. Harding's greatest untruths, wherein he repositeth his greatest trust, is clearly attained. As he hath dealt uprightly

M. Harding,
fol. 167.

Page 207.
[ed. 1570. pt.
2. chap. 8.
div. 1.]

M. Harding's
Confut. 340a.

herein, so mayest thou trust him in all the rest. By a small draft of sea-water, thou mayest judge the verdure of the whole.

But O, good God, what stir keepeth M. Harding amongst ^{M. Harding,} other his little pretty petite quarrels! He telleth thee, I ^{408, 409.} have named Johannes Camotensis ³⁹ for Johannes Carnotensis: and therein, as in a matter of great weight, he hath bestowed great store of void words, and four whole pages of his book. Verily a simple trespass, whereof to ground so great a battle. It is too light a labour to strive for names. If he like not the one, let him hardly take the other. Certainly Ghesnerus in his epitome ⁴⁰, and Cornelius ^{Ghesnerus. Cornel. Agrippa, de Vanitate Scientiarum.} Agrippa, call him plainly as I do, Johannes Camotensis. But be it Camotensis, be it Carnotensis, or what you will, his words be even as I allege them: *In ecclesia Romana sedent scribæ et Pharisei.....Ipse papa jam factus est intolerabilis: papæ pompam et fastum nullus tyrannorum unquam æquavit: ...papæ legati sic bacchantur in provinciis, ac si ad flagellandam ecclesiam Satan egressus sit a facie Domini.....Vim faciunt scripturis, ut habeant plenitudinem potestatis.* Let M. Harding grant thus much, and use the names at his pleasure.

Again he saith, I have named Zarabella for Zabarella: Heruæus for Johannes Parisiensis, Johannes Parisiensis for Heruæus, and Petrus a Scoto for Dominicus a Scoto. He saith I allege Heruæus by chapters, whereas Heruæus is divided by certain other distinctions, and not by chapters. He saith, I have named Pius Secundus by the name of pope Pius, a year, or a month, or some certain time before he was pope. No doubt a perilous case. The man was one, and his words were one, but his name was changed. In one place he saith, I have left out *enim*: in another place, I have left out *hoc*: in another place, my printer hath misplaced *schemate* for *schismate*: Pighius for Pighius: and I know not what. Such weighty causes hath M. Harding picked out to make up his tale. Hereat

³⁹ [Camotensis. See note ⁴⁶, in vol. ii. p. 217. The work quoted by Agrippa is Polycraticus, which Jewel himself refers to, Def. Apol. p. 544, ed. 1611, and elsewhere.]

⁴⁰ [Gesnerus in his *Bibliotheca* names the author of Polycraticus Carnotensis. The Editor has not discovered any work of Gesner's entitled Epitome.]

he lightneth, and thundereth, and shaketh sand and sea together. Hereat, and at other matters of like force he crieth out, “ Lewd wretches, Jewish, heathenish, shameless, blasphemous villains:” as if it were lawful for a doctor of Louvain to say what him listeth. If he espy any such simple oversight as I have shewed, or any sentence misalleged, or any one author misnamed, or any thing else that may be wrested from the purpose; he brayeth amain, “ false ministers: false harlots: ye brag: ye boast: ye lie falsely: ye lie for advantage: ye are impudent liars: lewd lies: heaps of lies: nothing but lies, and all is lies:” with as great wisdom and discretion, as did sometime Anaxagoras, the philosopher of Græcia: who, when he had seen a little pebble stone fallen down from heaven, imagined therefore that the sun, the moon, the stars, and all the whole heavens were made of stones. By these pretty posies and flowers of speech, we may easily descry M. Harding from all his fellows. Howbeit, herein I trust to be so unlike unto him, as he is like unto himself. Neither can our cause appear the worse in the judgment of the wise, for that M. Harding hath so good a grace to speak ill. Ill speech is not always proof sufficient of good matter. Maxentius saith, *Hæretici, cum perversitatis suæ non possunt reddere rationem, ad maledicta convertuntur*: “ Heretics, when they find themselves not able to yield a reason of their wilfulness, then they fall to plain railing.”

But one thing specially much misliketh M. Harding above all the rest, that, the better to disclose the deformities and weakness of his doctrine, I have alleged so many canonists and school doctors. For all them he weigheth no better now than Æsop’s fables. And therefore he saith,

Diogen.
Laertius.
[lib. 2.]

[Ed. Horm.
Resp. Bibl.
Mag. Patr.
tom. vi. pt. 1.
376.]

Detect. 277 b. “ As for the gewgaws of the schoolmen and canonists, I despise them utterly.” What then? would M. Harding that we should rather allege St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Hierom, St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and others the ancient and learned fathers, touching his private masses, his half-communions, his dumb prayers in a tongue unknown, and other like disorders of the church of Rome? Did ever any of these fathers either receive the holy sacrament himself alone, the whole people looking on him; or minister

the communion unto the people in one only kind ; or say the public prayers in a strange tongue, the people not knowing what he said ? Would any of these fathers ever have said, “ The pope hath universal power over all the world : we all receive of the pope’s fulness : the pope cannot err : the pope is above all general councils : the pope hath power over the angels of God : kings and princes hold their crowns and dominions of the pope ? ” Alas, these good fathers were dead many hundred years before these and other like vanities were known in the world.

But may it not be lawful for us, with M. Harding’s good favour, to allege such witnesses as best know the cause ? or was there ever any man justly reprov’d before any indifferent and reasonable judge, for producing of honest and lawful witnesses ? or, are all the school doctors and canonists now become *intestabiles*, that is to say, so far out of credit, so infamous, and so vile, that they may not be allowed to bear witness ? Whose then are they ? of whether side stand they ? are they not all M. Harding’s own doctors ? is he now ashamed of his own ? are they not all sworn to the see of Rome ? And what were they ? what rooms bare they in the church ? were they not abbots, bishops, archbishops, cardinals, saints, and popes ? was not Panormitan an abbot ? was not Albertus Magnus a bishop ? was not Antoninus an archbishop ? was not Holcot a cardinal ? was not Cajetanus a cardinal ? is not Bonaventura a saint ? is not Thomas a saint ? was not Innocentius II. a pope ? was not Adrianus a pope ? did not pope Gregory IX. write the Decretals ? did not pope Bonifacius VIII. write the Sextus ? did not pope Clemens write the Clementines ? did not pope Johannes XXII. and other popes write the Extravagantes ? were not these Christ’s vicars ? were they not Peter’s successors ? were they not the light of the world ? bare they not the keys of the kingdom of heaven ? is not Gratian called *fundamentum juris canonici*, and that even by Eugenius III. the pope himself ? were not these for the space of five hundred years together, the only rulers of the church of God ? were not their words holden for laws ? were there any others better, or better learned, or at all

any other doctors in the church ? of the school doctors, was not one called Subtilis, another Solennis, another Irrefragabilis, another Angelicus, another Seraphicus ? what warrant had we then of the faith of Christ, what doctrine, what sacraments, what discipline, what correction, what order, what comfort, but at their hands ? how could any consistory be holden, how could any man recover his right, how could the pope himself maintain his universal power and his triple crown, but only by them ?

And yet will M. Harding suddenly condemn them all, every one, by one sentence, abbots, bishops, archbishops, decrees, decretals, cardinals, saints, and popes, and all together ? will he make them all unable to bear witness ? will he thus despise them, and call them “gewgaws,” as if they were all tinkers and cobblers, and no better ?

I trow, M. Harding was not very well informed, when he suffered these things so unadvisedly to pass from him. Otherwise, to seek revenge upon his adversaries, he would not so sturdily have played Samson’s part, and so rashly have crushed the pillars whereby he leaned, and have shaken down the whole house upon himself. For, I beseech thee, ask M. Harding, what hath the pope to stand unto, when the school doctors and canonists be gone from him ? what old father, what ancient doctor, what council, what scripture is there left him ? what will he say to the doctors of our side, that so peremptorily and scornfully despiseth his own, and calleth them gewgaws ? It might have pleased him to have suffered them, as witnesses, quietly to have told their tales, specially in such cases, as no other man could know so well as they. For by them, and by them only, and by none else, we may see that great and horrible blindness and misery that Satan had brought into the church of God. For, although it be now removed from our eyes, yet in these canonists’ and doctors’ books, as in public records, it remaineth still. God’s holy name be praised for ever, that of his great mercy hath delivered us by the clearness and glory of his gospel.

Verily St. Paul, to advance the truth of God, and to confound his enemies, thought it no reproach to take wit-

ness of the heathen poets, Menander, Epimenides, and Aratus. The learned fathers, Tertullian, Clemens, Eusebius, Arnobius, take witness of the godless philosophers: St. Augustine of the Sibyls: Lactantius of Apollo's Oracles. Yea, M. Harding himself, when he is able, and when need so requireth, is contented to take witness of Leontius, of Abdias, of Amphilochius, of Homer the Greek poet, of Priscian the poor grammarian, of scholastical doctors, of canonists, of decrees, of decretals, of glosses, and margins, and spareth nothing. Yet now must they be despised altogether, and go for gewgaws, for children to play withal.

But we must pardon M. Harding, he dealeth indifferently, and is nothing partial. For even with like reverence he useth also the ancient doctors of the church, and others of later time, that fight of his side, and are allied unto him. "Tertullian," he saith, "was an heretic, and wrote this and that in defence of his heresy." "St. Cyprian," he saith, "stood in an ill cause, and defended a falsehood, and was driven to the very same shifts whereunto all heretics are driven." Again he saith: "We never took ourselves bound to any private opinion of whatsoever doctor. If in a secret point of learning St. Augustine or St. Cyprian teach singularly, we follow them not." "It seemeth," saith he, "St. Hierom was deceived by a rumour, as being far from the places where the truth might be known." "We bind not ourselves," saith he, "to maintain whatsoever Albertus Pigghius hath written." "Cardinal Cajetanus," saith he, "hath his errors: Erasmus and Agrippa be men of small credit: Alphonsus de Castro, Beatus Rhenanus, Platina, *Appendix Concilii Basiliensis*, are stuff little worth." Again, Johannes Gerson, the greatest learned man of his time, and the only director and leader of the council of Constance, whom Trithemius calleth *theologorum sui temporis longe principem*, is no better than "good plain father Gerson." To be short, Nilus, a Greek writer, and the archbishop of Thessalonica, if it like M. Harding, must bear the bable⁴².

M. Harding
Detect. 238,
239.
Detect. 271 b.

Confut. 232 b.

Confut. 285 b.

Confut. 232 b.

Detect. 307 b.

Detect. 307 a.

Confut. 206.

Detect. 225 b.

⁴² [Bable, i. q. bauble, the fool's ensign.]

Nicol. Cusan.
de Concord.
lib. 2. cap. 20.
[p. 749.]

Thus we see, M. Harding hath a commission to control all manner of doctors whatsoever, Greeks, Latins, old, new, his own and others, if they come not readily to his purpose. Nicolaus Cusanus saith, *Papa Eugenius dicit, hoc verum esse, si ipse velit, et non aliter*: "Pope Eugenius telleth us, this thing is true, if his holiness will have it true: and that otherwise it is not true." Such a power, I trow, M. Harding would claim unto himself, that nothing may be taken for true or false without his liking. Marcolphus will not lightly find a fit tree to hang himself on.

Tertull. de
Resurrec-
tione Carnis.
[cap. 5. p.
328.]

But M. Harding saith: "I allege great troops of doctors and other writers: but use no manner discourse of wit, as he himself doth, to enlarge my matters:" as though, whoso hath most words spake always best to purpose. The learned father Tertullian said sometime upon like occasion: *Rhetoricari quoque nos provocant hæretici*: "These heretics would have us play the rhetoricians, to emboss out our matters with show of words," and of a molehill to make a mountain as they do. As for M. Harding, what discourses he useth, it may easily appear, by that in his last Detection, he hath discoursed us two hundred and six whole sides of paper only in preambles and prefaces, before he once stepped into his matter. And good reason is it, that, when scriptures and doctors will not serve, then discourse of wit should hold the plough. Although M. Harding want weight of matter, yet at least he hath words at will. They cost him but little. Vessels never give so great a sound as when they be empty. A courthegian of Rome will prank herself more trimly than a virtuous lady. It is an easy matter, with masks, and vizards, and long discourses, to fray the simple. The poor ass will roar out sometimes like a lion.

I go directly and shortly to the matter, and delight not, as M. Harding doth, to set my words to sale by discourse of speech; but think it sufficient only to allege the words and authorities of the ancient fathers. Of the other side, M. Harding out of the ancient fathers allegeth, either nothing at all, or very little, or little to the purpose: but

feedeth us with words enow of his own, that is to say, (and let him pardon my plainness,) not with the best or wisest words that might be spoken.

“The protestants,” saith he, “are divided and scattered Detect. 35 a. into sects and factions, not one of them agreeing with the other. They have twenty sundry opinions touching justification: they have six and thirty opinions touching the communion in both kinds.” So precisely M. Harding keepeth his reckonings. And yet perhaps if he were called suddenly to an audit of all these six and fifty sundry opinions, he were not able to reckon four. But M. Harding may lawfully discourse at pleasure, as a man liking well his own wit, and in respect thereof misliking all others.

Again he saith: “The protestants have forsaken Christ: Detect. 7 34 a. the protestants are become Jews: the protestants will be circumcised according to Moses’ law: the protestants require to have the paschal lamb: the protestants tell their Detect. 33 b. people, there is no hell at all: the protestants teach us, Detect. 82 b. that God is bound to obey the devil: the protestants at their next proceeding will utterly deny God.” So likewise saith Cardinal Pole, a man that would highly be commended for his modesty: “The protestants,” saith he, Ad Henricum 8. lib. 3. “will shortly deny, that Christ is Messias, the anointed of God.” Another of them saith with like discretion: “The Copus Dial. 6. pag. 878. protestants deny, that Christ ever appeared in the flesh⁴¹.” And again he saith, “Peter Martyr denied, that Christ is Copus Dial. 3. p. 331. our intercessor.” There is no tale so unlikely, but by such pretty discourses it may be proved.

Again: throughout the whole discourse of all his books, he telleth us, that “the blessed succession of Peter shall ⁸ never fail: that the pope’s chair is the very knot of Christian unity: that the church of Rome is the universal church of God: that the pope is the only universal governor

⁴¹ [The real author of the six Dialogues under the name of Copus was Nicholas Harpsfield, professor of Greek at Oxford, arch-deacon of Canterbury, &c. See Wood’s *Athenæ*. The Dialogues profess, inter alia, to confute the Apology.]

of all the world : that the pope may not be controlled or judged by any power : that the pope is above all general councils : that the pope hath authority over the souls in purgatory : and over the angels of God : that St. Augustine, St. Hierom, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom," and all other the doctors and holy fathers, might err : but the pope only can never err.

- 9 If thou tell him, that many popes have erred, and shamefully erred, as it is evident and easy to prove, he will answer thee, "They erred only as men, but not as popes." For the pope hath sundry capacities in one person : sometimes we must take him as a man, and sometimes as no man.

If thou tell him that popes have erred, even as they were popes, then will he answer thee, that the pope may err, and hath erred in some certain particular cause or question : but in faith or doctrine he cannot err.

If thou tell him, that sundry popes have maintained open and known heresies, and therefore have undoubtedly erred in faith and doctrine ; then will he tell thee, that they maintained such heresies, "only as their own private opinions," but not as doctrine for the church. Again, if thou tell him, that certain popes have published, and preached, and taught heresies, and sent abroad preachers to confirm the same ; then will he tell thee, that, although they preached and confirmed heresies, yet they "never confirmed them by public decree and open sentence in their consistories:" as if the pope's consistory were of greater weight in matter of doctrine than his pulpit.

Thus M. Harding discourseth about the fields, *a primo ad ultimum*, from error to man, from man to pope, from pope to judgment, from judgment to faith, from faith to opinion, from opinion to preaching, from preaching to decree, and so from one thing to another : and, whereas one thing will not serve, by discourse of wit he seeketh a better.

All these songs he sang us before, in his Answer, in his Rejoinder, and in his Confutation : and now, when all is

done, as a silly minstrel, is fain to fall to discoursing, and to sing the same about again. Otherwise he should lack work for his printer.

To shadow the notorious ambition of the church of Rome, openly condemned in the great council of Africa, and called the smoky pomp of the world, either ignorantly or guilefully he corrupteth the plain text, and turneth *petentes* into *potentes*, that is to say, he turneth poor “suiters” into “princes.” Good reader, turn to the place, and consider the answer that I have made hereto : and then ask of M. Harding, what discourse, or what wit was this, to corrupt his translation, to falsify the sense, to turn *pe* into *po*, and one word into another ? ask of him, what he meant, with so sensible forgery to seek to mock thee.

Again, whereas St. Basil writeth thus unto Athanasius the patriarch of Alexandria : *Visum est utile, ut scribatur ad episcopum Romanum, ut consideret res nostras, et det consilium* : “It seemeth good we write to the bishop of Rome, that he consider of our case, and give us counsel,” M. Harding by his proper discourings hath thought it better thus to English the same words : “It hath seemed good, that we write to the bishop of Rome, that he visit us, and determine the matter by his sentence.” “That the bishop of Rome consider our case,” saith St. Basil : “That the bishop of Rome visit us,” saith M. Harding : “That the bishop of Rome give us counsel, what we may do,” saith St. Basil : “That the bishop of Rome determine the matter by his sentence,” saith M. Harding. Thus by his discoursing he hath changed “considering” into “visiting,” and “giving of counsel” into “sentence in judgment.”

But ask him, I pray thee, what discourse of wit moved him to change all the Latin translations of St. Basil that ever he saw, and to forge us a new translation of his own. Ask him wherefore this Greek word, ἐπισκέπτομαι, may not well be englished, “to consider.” Ask him, wherefore these Greek words, δοῦναι γνώμην, may not well be englished, “to give counsel.” Ask him, where he ever read, in any allowed Greek writer, these words, δοῦναι γνώμην, used for a “decree,” or “sentence in judgment.” Ask him, what made him so bold, to shape us new Greek words of his own,

Quibuscun-
que Potenti-
bus.
Quibuscun-
que Potenti-
bus.

τινῶν αἰ-
τούντων.

p. 123. [ed.
1570. pt. 2.
cap. 3. div. 5.]

Basil. in
Epist. ad
Athanasium.
[iii. 162.]

M. Harding's
Detect. 179 b.
Defence 129.
[ubi supra.]
Ut consideret
res nostras.

Ut det con-
silium.

such as no Grecian ever heard before. Ἐπισκέψαι, saith M. Harding, and again, ἐπισκέψαι, twice together in one place. But bid him leave his long discourses and shows of wit, and plainly to tell thee, even as he will be counted a Grecian, in what historiographer, in what orator, in what philosopher, in what poet, he ever heard of this word ἐπισκέψαι. Tell him, good reader, tell him, this verb is not ἐπισκέπτω, as he imagineth, but ἐπισκέπτομαι. And bid him not to trust to his dictionary, for it will deceive him. Ἐπισκέπτομαι, I say, is the original verb, and not ἐπισκέπτω. And therefore the first indefinite is not ἐπισκέψαι, as M. Harding telleth thee, but ἐπισκέψασθαι. It was sufficient for him to mock thee with Latin and English. But of himself to devise new Greek words and new grammars wherewith to mock thee, it was too much.

Detect. 67.
Defence.

By his discourses he is able to defend these words of Hostiensis : *Deus et papa faciunt unum consistorium : excepto peccato, papa potest quasi omnia facere, quæ potest Deus* : “ God and the pope have one judgment seat : and, sin only excepted, the pope can do in a manner all things that God can do.” Whereby, I trow, is meant, that, as God is omnipotent, so in a manner is the pope.

Detect. 358.

By his discourses he is able to defend that most horrible and blasphemous prayer, devised and used in the church of Rome, *Tu per Thomæ sanguinem*, &c. to the manifest prejudice and derogation of the blood of Christ⁴². By his discourses, he is able to defend these words of Catharinus, lately pronounced in the council of Trident : “ Our lady is Christ’s most faithful fellow,” making a creature equal and fellow with Christ the Creator, which is God blessed for ever.

Detect. 399 b.
400.

To be short, by his discourses, he is well able to defend these most vile and filthy words, touching priests’ concubines, uttered to most vile and filthy purpose : *Si non caste, tamen caute* : “ If they cannot live chastely, yet let them deal charily.” “ The circumstance considered,” saith M. Harding, “ all this may seem to be well and discreetly (and chastely) said, and to give us very good counsel.”

⁴² [See Def. of Apol. (ed. 1611. p. 295.) part 2. ch. 18. div. 1.]

O merciful God, whither will M. Harding lead us at last with his discourses! Such discreet and wholesome counsel he might have learned of Mitio in the heathen comedy: for thus he saith: *Non est flagitium, mihi crede, adolescentem scortari.*

Yet further to prove that he hath a ready wit to course at pleasure, he saith unto us frankly, and by way of grant: What if some have written that poison was ministered in the blessed sacrament? what if the pope suffered Francis Dandalas, the Venetian's ambassador, to lie under his table like a dog, while he was at dinner? what if popes have suffered great princes and monarchs to kiss their feet, to hold their stirrups, and to lead their horses? what if pope Alexander used Frederic the emperor more proudly than became a man of his calling, treading him down to the ground, and setting his foot on his neck? Be these things never so true, never so tyrannical, and never so horrible, yet if M. Harding once say, What if, by discourse of his wit, they may soon be solved.

M. Harding
in his Preface
to the Reader.

By such discourses he is able to prove his private masses, his demi-communions, his primacies, his pardons, his purgatories, and what thing soever shall come to hand. When scriptures fail, then discourse of wit must come in place: and when wit and discourse will not serve, then good plain round railing must serve the turn. Then, saith he, "ye are proud, ye are Lucifer-like, ye serve the devil." Then he telleth the world, "M. Jewel is worse than Ananias, that condemned St. Paul: M. Jewel playeth the part of Antichrist: M. Jewel is the open enemy of the church: M. Jewel is the enemy of God: M. Jewel honoureth that idol Calvin more than Jesus Christ: M. Jewel is Messias: M. Jewel is Christ: M. Jewel is better than Christ." Then he discourseth and flingeth now at his Lutherans: now at his Huguenots: now at Browne: now at the puritans: now at Bale: now at Illyricus.

M. Harding's
Detect. 39 b.
Detect. 210.
245.
Detect. 40.
Detect. 359.
Detect. 210.
Detect. 212.

Thus he jumpeth and courseth this way and that way, as a man roving without a mark, or a ship floating without a rudder. Thus he sheweth us a mountain of

words without substance, and a house full of smoke without fire: and imagineth, that his little elder pipe, by discourse of wit, will resemble the sound of a double cannon. When all is done, we may say of him, as the poor man said that shore his sow, Here is great cry, and little wool

Good reader, truth is plain and homely, and hath no need of these habiliments. But whoso will take upon him to maintain untruth, must needs be forced to discourse about with long vagaries, to lead his reader from the purpose, to feed him with words for want of matter, and briefly to do even as here M. Harding doth.

I cannot imagine, that any my poor labours shall be able to end these quarrels. For a contentious man will never lack words. Notwithstanding, in this augmentation I have endeavoured for my simple part to say so much as to a reasonable man may seem sufficient. I have cleared such places as seemed dark: I have supplied such things as seemed to want: I have reformed so much as reason required: briefly, I have answered the substance of all M. Harding's long discourses. If any thing be left unanswered, either it was nothing, or nothing worth.

May it please thee, good Christian reader, to peruse both, and to judge uprightly. Endeavour thoroughly to know the cause. An ignorant judge was never indifferent. M. Harding would have thee only to follow the example of thy late deceived fathers, and further to search and know nothing. And oftentimes thine ignorance maketh him bold. He leadeth thee into the darkness of death, and yet would have thee believe thou art in paradise. The blind man is led he knoweth not whither. But search thou the scriptures, as Christ himself biddeth thee: learn to know the will of God, as St. Paul adviseth thee: have pleasure in God's holy word, as the prophet David warneth thee, and thou shalt never be deceived: whereas building upon the sand of witty discourses, and the variable weakness of men's judgments, sometimes allowed, and sometimes re-proved, thy house must needs come to ground.

Tell M. Harding, it shall be hard for him to kick still

against the spur. God hath sowed the seed of life. No power is able to root it out. God hath disclosed the man of sin : no cloak is able to hide him longer. Heaven and earth shall pass : but God's word shall never pass. God open the eyes of thy heart, that thou mayest have comfort in his light, and rejoice in his mercies, and patiently wait for that blessed hope that is laid up for thee, and continue faithful unto the end. *Amen.*

From Salisbury, 11th Decemb. 1569.

[In the original edition and in subsequent ones, there followed in this place a long catalogue, occupying three folio pages, of what Jewel calls "certain principal flowers of M. Harding's modest speech." The modern reader will not be displeased with the present Editor, for omitting this tedious and offensive specimen of controversial warfare. It is impossible however to read a page of Harding's, without meeting with evidence of his powers of railing, quite sufficient to account for the notice which Jewel takes of his coarse vulgarity.]

TO

THE CHRISTIAN READER⁴¹.

IT pitieth me in thy behalf, good Christian reader, to see thy conscience thus assaulted this day with so contrary doctrines of religion: and specially if thou have a zeal to follow, and seest not what: and wouldest fain please God, and knowest not how: nor findest thyself sufficiently armed with God's Holy Spirit: nor able either to discern thy meat from poison, or to unwind thyself out of the snares.

² Cor. xi. 14. "For Satan transformeth himself into an angel of light:" the wicked is more watchful and vehement than the godly: and falsehood is oftentimes painted and beautified, and shineth more glorious than the truth.

² Tim. ii. 14. These be the things, that, as St. Paul saith, "work the subversion of the hearers:" and by mean whereof, as Matt. xxiv. 24, Christ saith, "If it were possible, the very elect of God should be deceived:" howbeit, "God knoweth his own," ² Tim. ii. 19. and no power can pull them out of his hand." God is able to work comfort out of confusion, and to force his light to shine out of darkness. ^{John x. 27, 28.} "All things work unto good, unto them that be in Christ Jesu." Be falsehood never so rashly coloured, yet in the end the truth will conquer.

^{Rom. viii. 28.} Notwithstanding, God in these days hath so amazed the adversaries of his gospel, and hath caused them so openly and so grossly to lay abroad their follies to the sight and

⁴¹ [This was the Preface to the first edition.]

face of all the world, that no man now, be he never so ignorant, can think he may justly be excused. They deal not now so subtly as other heretics in old times were wont to do: they hide not the loathsomeness of their errors: they cloak not themselves in sheepskins: they dissemble nothing: they excuse nothing: but, without either shame of man or fear of God, they rake up those things that before were buried, that themselves had forsaken, the wise had abhorred, the world had loathed. It had been more policy for them to have yielded in somewhat, and to have stayed in the rest. So there might have appeared some plainness in their dealings.

But this is God's just judgment, that they, that wilfully withstand the truth, should be given over to maintain lies, as being the "children of untruth, children that will not Isa. xxx. 9. hear the law of God."

For trial whereof, I beseech thee, good reader, advisedly to peruse these few notes, truly taken out of M. Harding's late Confutation. Judge thereof, as thou shalt see cause. Let no affection or phantasy cause things to seem otherwise than they be.

The two principal grounds of this whole book are these: "First, that the pope, although he may err by personal error in his own private judgment as a man, and as a particular doctor in his own opinion; yet as he is pope, as he is the successor of Peter, as he is the vicar of Christ in earth, and as he is the shepherd of the universal church, in public judgment, in deliberation and definitive sentence, he never erreth, nor never erred, nor never can err." As if he would say, The pope walking in his gallery is one man, and sitting in his consistory, or in judgment, is another: which thing to hold, Alphonsus de Castro saith, it is mere folly. Yet is this M. Harding's chiefest, or rather, as I might in manner say, his only ground. M. Harding, fol. 334 b.

The second is this: "The church of Rome is the whole and only catholic church of God: and whosoever is not obedient unto the same must be judged an heretic." These two grounds being once well and surely laid, he may build at pleasure what him listeth. Alphons. lib. 1. cap. 4. Confut. 16 b. 261 b.

Confut. 48 b. As for the pope, the better to countenance his estate, he saith, that Peter received power ordinary to himself and to his successors for ever: but his fellows had power only by dispensation: "That Peter was the shepherd, and the apostles the sheep:" and that the apostles were subject unto Peter, as the sheep are subject to the shepherd: and "that James the apostle was a member of Peter."

Confut. 335 a. 48 b. For better warrant whereof pope Leo saith: *Petrum Christus in consortium individuae unitatis assumptum, id, quod ipse erat, voluit nominari*: "Christ receiving Peter into the company of the indivisible unity, would him to be called the same that he was himself⁴²."

Upon affiance and trust of these words, M. Harding endoweth the pope with Christ's only prerogative, and calleth him by Christ's principal title, "the prince of pastors."

Confut. 50 a. And further he saith, Of the pope hangeth the safety of the whole church of God: that unto the pope is given all manner of power, as well in heaven as in earth: and that, if any man say the pope hath authority to command the angels and archangels of God, to come, to go, to wait, to run, to carry, to fetch, "we may not be scrupulous," (for these be his words,) "in any such matters:" that neither king, nor emperor, nor clergy, nor council, nor any power alive can have authority to judge the pope, be his life never so vile: that the pope is endued with a divine or a godly power, and that by the same he is able to depose kings: that the pope, even by the institution of Christ, is a temporal prince, and hath the right and interest of both swords, as well temporal as spiritual: that all kings and emperors, by the commandment of Christ, receive their whole power and authority from the pope: that the pope in a right good sense may be called "the king of kings," and "lord of lords:" like as also in some good sense he may be called, "our lord and god:" (and therefore one of M. Harding's fellows saith: "The pope is the head, and kings and princes are the feet:") that the pope, whatsoever

⁴² [Leo, epist. 89. This is evidently the source from which Nicolas III. borrowed his decree, in 6^o De Electione et Electi Potestate. Supra, vol. ii. p. 310, note ¹³.]

he be, is always a Christian man, "by the nature of his office:" and therefore another of them saith: *Judasne sit, an Petrus, an Paulus, Deus attendi non vult: sed solum hoc, quod sedet in cathedra Petri*: "Whether the pope be Judas" (the traitor), "or Peter, or Paul, thereof God never bade us be careful. This only is sufficient for us, that he sitteth in Peter's chair." Likewise M. Harding saith: "It shall be sufficient for us to do, as Peter's successors bid us to do:" "Christ," saith M. Harding, "now requireth not of us to obey Peter or Paul, but him that sitteth in their chair."

Hosius in
Confessione
Petricovien.
cap. 29. [fol.
22. col. 2.]

Confut. 192 a.

Confut. 192 b.

Again he saith, The whole church of God is the pope's vineyard: the pope is the head, and all the faithful of Christ be his members: the preservation of the whole church standeth in the unity of the pope: and therefore Hosius saith, *Absque uno (papa) ecclesia una esse non potest*: "Without one pope the church of God cannot be one." To conclude, M. Harding saith, "Without the obedience of the pope, there is no hope of salvation." Thus much hath M. Harding taught us as most sound and most catholic doctrine, touching the authority of the pope.

Confut. 283 b.

Confut. 284 a.

283 b.

Confut. 212 b.

Hosius in
Confessione
Petricovien.
cap. 26. [fol.
44.]

Confut. 306 b.

Of the other side he saith, "The church of Rome is the universal and only church of God:" and that whatsoever doctrine hath been taught in the same, ought to be taken as godly and catholic: and that all other churches of the other apostles might err and fail, but the church of Rome, even by God's especial promise, whatsoever she teach, can never err.

Confut. 16 b.

262 b.

Confut. 196 a.

He fighteth as freely for his pardons and purgatories, as he could do for the faith of the holy Trinity. Nathan said unto David, "Our Lord hath put away thy sin: thou shalt not die:" again St. Paul saith, "Bear one of you another's burthens." "Hereby," saith M. Harding, "it is plain, that the pope hath power to give pardons: and Christ gave St. Peter special authority to bestow the same."

2 Sam. xli. 13.

Galat. vi. 2.

Confut. 251

a. b.

Confut. 180 b.

But the determination and full discussion of these great matters, of pardons and purgatory, he saith, is very hard, and marvellous intricate.

Confut. 252 b.

Whereas they, not without manifest blasphemy, have universally taught the people thus to call upon the blessed

virgin the mother of Christ, "Thou art the lady of angels : thou art the queen of heaven : give commandment unto thy son : let him know, thou art the mother:" whereas also another of them saith, "Our lady is God's most faithful fellow, *fidelissima ejus socia*," thus making a creature equal in fellowship unto God : "All this," saith M. Harding, "is nothing else, but a" (pretty kind of) "spiritual dalliance : and he is most impious and impudent, that findeth fault with it."

Council. Tri-
dent, sess. 2.
[Crabbe, iii.
988.]
Confut. 123 a.

Jacob. Nan-
clantus in
Epist. ad
Rom. cap. 1.
Jacob. Payva,
lib. 9.

Polydor. de
Inventorib.
lib. 6. cap. 13.
Hæc pars
[i. e. the wor-
ship of ima-
ges] *pietatis*
differt non
multum ab
impietate.
Confut. 292 b.

And notwithstanding even now they teach⁴³ the people to fall down and to worship the image of Christ, not as they were wont before to say, giving the whole honour unto Christ that is signified by the image, but even with the selfsame honour that is due to Christ himself, and that without any scruple or doubt of conscience : notwithstanding also some of his own company say, "The selfsame kind of devotion that is now done to images, differeth but little from open wickedness:" yet M. Harding saith, We know no kind of idolatry ever used in the church of Rome : neither is there any idolatry committed by us, in worshiping of saints, in praying to them, or in the reverence we exhibit unto their images. Notwithstanding sundry others the best learned and wisest of his side have plainly confessed divers great errors and deformities in their church : notwithstanding the pope, his cardinals, and his bishops slug, and sleep, and do nothing : notwithstanding God's everlasting light, as much as in them lieth, be hid under the bushel : notwithstanding the watchmen be blind, the dogs be dumb, the salt be unsavory : the people of God sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, and know neither their own profession, nor the use and meaning of their sacraments, nor what they believe, nor what they hope, nor what they worship, nor what they pray : (as for his offering up of forms and accidents in a sacrifice unto God, for so fondly he writeth, I trow, to relieve both the quick and the dead, with other errors of greater import-

⁴³ [The Editor has not hitherto succeeded in finding a copy of Nanclantus. Payva says expressly, "... eadem certe pietate

"cultu et religione ipsam (crucem) qua et Christum ipsum prosequi necesse est." The reference to Payva, supra iii. 258, is correct.]

ance, wherewith he may more easily astonne the people, I will say nothing.) All this notwithstanding, M. Harding doubteth not to say, "If Christ himself or his apostles Rejoind. 23 b. were alive again, the word, that is to say, the doctrine of our belief now preached and received in the catholic Confut. 254 a. church" (of Rome), "neither should be altered, nor could be bettered."

And therefore he saith further: "Such wicked changes Confut. 274 a. in religion as ye have made, it is lawful to make neither with a council, nor without a council." Again: "Our Confut. 271. doctrine hath been too long approved to be put in daying ⁴⁴ in these days:" and therefore again, for a final conclusion he saith thus: "Set your hearts at rest: it shall not be so." Confut. 331.

These be the special contents and implements of M. Harding's whole book of Confutation, which he wisheth us to receive under his warrant, as the whole and only catholic faith of Christ: by force whereof he thinketh himself able to subdue and bind the whole world. If the things that he maintaineth be so fond, what may we then think of other things that he denieth?

Now, what substance of learning out of the scriptures, councils, and doctors truly alleged, he hath brought us forth for better furniture of the same, I leave it wholly to be weighed by others. Verily, utterance and eloquence, and sound of words, and boldness of speech he wanteth none. Howbeit, oftentimes in the fairest rose thou mayest soonest find a canker.

But here, good Christian reader, our books thus laid in the midst before thee, I beseech thee to consider, with what indifferent judgment M. Harding would have thee to pass between us.

First he saith: "What should we seek for truth? Let Rejoind. In the Preface to the Reader. us only behold the custom of the church." Again: "What *iii b. arguments, what allegations, what show of disproof soever he bring against these things, we ought to make small account thereof." Again: "I would bless myself from him, *iii a. as from the minister of Satan, and as from the disciple of Antichrist, and as from God's open and professed enemy."

⁴⁴ [In daying, i. e. to arbitration.]

*iii b.

Again: "M. Jewel's Reply, and otherlike heretical books, are unlawful to be read, by order of the church, without special license: and are utterly forbidden to be read or kept under pain of excommunication." And again: "As for the Reply, none other way will serve, but to throw all into the fire."

**ii a.

Of the other side, touching the word of God, with most terrible words he frayeth thee from it, and biddeth thee to consider of other things, and to behold I know not what.

Rejoind. In
the Preface
to M. Jewel,
A. 1.

Confut. 213 a.

Rejoind. In
the Preface
to the Read-
er.

"Ye prostitute the scriptures," he saith, "as bawds do their harlots, to the ungodly, unlearned, rascal people."

Again: "Prentices, light persons, and the riffraff of the people." And again: "The unlearned people were kept from the reading of the scriptures by the special providence of God, that precious stones should not be thrown before swine." In such regard these men have, as well the holy scriptures, as also the people of God. The scriptures they resemble to common harlots, and the vilest creatures of the stews. The people of God they call "ungodly, rascals, riffraff," and "filthy swine."

M. Harding
in his An-
swer, art. 15.
div. 7.

Thus he suffereth thee not to read, either my poor book, whereof thou shouldest judge, or the holy word of God, whereby thou mightest be able to judge: but only biddeth thee to follow him, and to say as he saith, and all is safe. Thus, first he blindeth thine eyes, and then willet thee to look about, and to condemn the thing thou never knewest.

Hieron. in
Esalam, lib.
9. cap. 30.
[iii. 258.]

So saith St. Hierom: *Isti tantam sibi assumunt auctoritatem, ut sive dextra doceant, sive sinistra, id est, sive bona, sive mala, nolint discipulos ratione discutere, sed se præcessores sequi*: "These men take so much upon themselves, that whether they teach with the right hand or with the left, that is to say, whether they teach good things or bad, they will not have their hearers or learners to inquire causes, wherefore they should do this or that: but only to follow them, being their leaders."

But beware, I beseech thee, good Christian reader. A simple eye is soon beguiled. It is very coarse wool that will take no colour. It is a desperate cause, that with words and eloquence may not be smoothed. Be not deceived. Remember of what matters and with what adver-

saries thou hast to deal. With fear and reverence be careful of thine own salvation. Lay down all affection and favour of parties. Judge justly of that shall be alleged. Unless thou know, thou canst not judge: unless thou hear both sides, thou canst not know. If thou like ought, know why thou likest it. A wise man in each thing will search the cause. He that cannot judge gold by sound, or in sight, yet may try it by the poise. If thou canst not weigh these matters for want of learning, yet so sensible and so gross they are, thou mayst feel them with thy fingers. Thou mayest soon find a difference between gold and brass: between Jacob and Esau: between a face and a vizard: between a full body and an empty shadow.

Say not, thou art settled in thy belief, before thou know it. Vain faith is no faith. St. Augustine's counsel is good: "Believe no more of Christ than Christ hath willed thee to believe: *Nemo de Christo credat, nisi quod de se credi voluit Christus*. Likewise he saith: *Fides stulta non prodest, sed obest*: "Fond faith is hurtful, and doth no good." St. Hilary saith: *Non minus est Deum fingere, quam negare*: "To devise fancies of God, it is as horrible as to say, there is no God." The ancient father Tertullian, speaking of the enemies of the cross of Christ, that disdained to submit their wills to the will of God, saith thus: *Amant ignorare, cum alii gaudeant cognovisse.....Malunt nescire, quod jam oderunt. Adeo quod nesciunt, præjudicant id esse, quod, si scirent, odisse non possent*: "They desire to be ignorant, whereas other folks desire to know. They would not know the truth, because they hate it." (Whatsoever it be) "they imagine it to be the same thing that they hate. But, if they knew it indeed, they could not hate it." Let reason lead thee: let authority move thee: let truth enforce thee. The wise man saith, "Whoso feareth the Lord will not be wilful against his word." God of his mercy confound all errors: give the victory to his truth: and glory to his holy name. Amen.

August. de
Tempore,
serm. 145.
[v. 995.]

† August. in
Question.
Veter. Testa-
ment. quæst.
43. [iii. app.
56.]

Hilar. in
Psal. i. [p.
18.]

Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[cap. 1, p. 2.]

Ecclus. viii.
[11. 18.]

From London, 17th Octob. 1567.

A N A N S W E R

TO A CERTAIN BOOK LATELY SET FORTH
BY M. HARDING ;

AND ENTITLED,

“ A CONFUTATION OF THE APOLOGY OF
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.”

The Title of the Apology.

A N Apology, or Answer, in Defence of the Church [Vol. iv. p. 5.]
of England ; with a brief and plain declaration
of the true religion professed and used in the same⁴³.

The Confutation by M. Harding.

Whereas these defenders take upon them the name of the church of England, setting forth thereby a face of authority, they do much like the ass that Æsop telleth of, which, to make the beasts afraid, had put on him a lion's skin, and therewith jettèd abroad terribly. For as the lion's skin was but lapped about him, and grew not to his body : so they, being indeed no lively members nor part of the church, cover themselves under the title and name of the church, the rather to beguile the simple. And verily herein they follow the wont of all heretics. For never was there any sect of heretics hitherto, which hath not claimed to be accounted and called the church. For which cause of certain ancient fathers, they have been likened to apes : whose property is, though they be apes, yet to counterfeit men, and to covet to seem men. Novatianus, as saith St. Cyprian, after the manner of apes, would challenge to himself the authority of the catholic church :

In Epist. ad
Jubalianum
de Hæreticis
Baptizandis.
[p. 130.]

⁴³ [The reference in the inner margin opposite to each section of the Defence is to the Latin edition of the Apology, as printed supra in this volume.]

and, whereas himself was not in the church, but contrariwise, a rebel against the church, took upon him to affirm, That all other were heretics : and presumed to uphold, the church was on his side. Irenæus and Tertullian, who were before him, write, That heretics made so much ado to persuade that the church was among themselves only, that they feared not to call the right-believing and catholic church, heretical and schismatical. St. Hilary, declaring how patiently he demeaned himself towards the Arians his enemies, by whom he was banished, writeth, " That in five years' space, whiles he lived in banishment, he never spake nor wrote evil word against them which falsely said themselves to be the church of Christ, and were the synagogue of Antichrist." The Donatists, against whom St. Augustine wrote much, said, " That the Christianity was quite lost and gone out of so many nations that be in the world, and remained only in Afric, and that the church was only there." In St. Bernard's time also, the heretics who would be called apostolics, as they of our time call themselves gospellers, said, " that they were the church."

But what mean all heretics (may we judge) by coveting so much to be seen that which they are not ? Forsooth they mean none other thing than their father the devil meaneth, when he goeth about to beguile man : for then what doth he ? useth he not this policy, to change his ugly hue, and put himself in goodly shape of an angel of light ? For he is not unwitting, that if he shewed himself in his own form, such as he is, that every one would fly from him, and none lightly would be deceived by him. Heretics do the like : although they hate the church never so deadly, yet to have the more opportunity to hurt it, pretend themselves to be of the church. For they be not ignorant how great the authority of the church is. Of whose governors Christ said, " He that heareth you, heareth me : and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." And again, " Tell the church." They consider in what credit the church is with all Christian people : how they stay themselves by it, " as being the pillar and ground of the truth : " how they love her, even as their common mother : how they honour it, " as the body and fulness of Christ," as the spouse of Christ, through faith, according to that is written, " I will despouse thee to me in faith : as the true Sion, which our Lord hath chosen to be his habitation and his resting place for ever : " as the safe ark to keep us from drowning in the dangerous seas of this world, out of which, no less than once out of the ark of Noah, is no salvation. Again, they know the church must needs be greatly esteemed among all the godly, for the singular promises Christ hath made to it : " that he would be with it all days to the end of the world : " " that he would pray to his Father for the Holy Ghost to be given to it : " " the Spirit of truth to remain with it for ever." But as heretics impugn the law by the words of the law, as St. Ambrose saith, so to overthrow the church, they presume to take unto them the name of

De Præscript. Hær.

Contra Constantium.

Augustin. contra Epist. Parmen. lib. 2. cap. 1. [ix. 25.]

Bernard. in Cant. serm. 66. Apostolici. [iv. 1500.]

2 Cor. xi. 19.

Luke x. 16.

Matt. xviii. 17.

1 Tim. iii. 15.

Ephes. i. 23.

Hosea ii. 19.

Psal. cxxxii. 14.

Gen. vii.

† In Comment. in Epist. ad Tit. cap. 3. [app. 316.]

the church. But what do heretics, when they are urged and wrung, when by force and arguments they are straited, and as it were driven to the wall? when it is plainly proved to their face, which is soon done, that they be not in nor of the church, specially being of heresy openly denounced, and by just excommunication cut off from the church? In this case the practice of the gossellers is, utterly to set the church at nought, and with a hot raging spirit to defy it, and to say, That themselves be the catholic church, and that the catholics be the papistical church, the church of Antichrist, the whore of Babylon, a den of thieves, and I cannot tell what.

The wont of the gossellers being excommunicate out of the church.

The Answer by the bishop of Salisbury.

To answer M. Harding to every parcel of his book, being so long, it would be too tedious. Wherefore, leaving many his impertinent speeches, and other unnecessary and waste words, which sundry his friends think he might better have spared, I will touch only so much thereof as shall bear some show of substance, and may any way seem worthy to be answered⁴⁴.

First, touching the church of God, we believe and confess all that M. Harding hath here said, or otherwise can be said. It is the pillar of the truth, the body, the fulness, and spouse of Christ. All these words are undoubtedly true and certain. And therefore, M. Harding, you are the more blame-worthy, that of the house of God, being so glorious, have made a cave of thieves: and have turned the beauty of Sion into the confusion of Babylon.

True it is, that heretics have evermore apparelled themselves with the name of the church: as Antichrist also shall procure himself credit under the name of Christ. Thus did your fathers, M. Harding, long ago. They said then, even as you say now, "We are the children of Abraham: we are the inheritors of God's promises:" "we have the temple of God: the temple of God." "The law shall never pass from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet." Thus continuing wilfully in the open breach of God's commandment, nevertheless they

1 Tim. iii. 15.
Ephes. i. 23.

John viii. 39.
Jerem. vii. 4.
Jerem. xviii. 18.

⁴⁴ [The Editor will of course examine carefully the parts omitted, and, if any thing of importance should be contained in them, he will mention it in the notes.]

cherished themselves then, as you do now, only with the bare title of the church : in whose name, whatsoever credit ye can any wise win, your meaning is, skilfully to convey the same over wholly to the church of Rome : as if that church only were the church of God, and without that there were no hope of salvation. And therefore you defend and hold for truth, That your church hath authority above God's word. And pope Nicholas saith, " Whoso denieth the privilege and supremacy of the see of Rome, hath renounced the faith, and is an heretic." And thus, as Leo saith, *Ecclesie nomine armamini, et contra ecclesiam dimicatis* : " Ye arm yourselves with the name of the church, and yet ye fight against the church." Likewise saith St. Cyprian : *Diabolus excogitavit novam fraudem, ut sub ipso nominis Christiani titulo fallat incautos* : " The devil hath devised a new kind of policy, under the very title of the name of Christ, to deceive the simple."

[Extrav.
Comm.]
De Major. et
Obed. Unam
Sanctam.
Dist. 22.
Omnes.

Leo, epist.
83. ad Pa-
laestinos. [l.
637.]

Cyprian, de
Simplicitate
Præla. [p.
194.]

Now concerning that hot raging spirit, wherewith, M. Harding saith, the gossellers defy the church and set it at nought, verily I think it a hard matter for any gosseller, be he never so hot, in such kind of eloquence to match M. Harding. Neither yet may he well condemn all such, as in the like cases have been hot and earnest. Esay the prophet saith, " O ye princes of Sodom, and ye people of Gomorrha." John the Baptist saith to the scribes and Pharisees, " O ye serpents, ye generation of vipers and adders." Christ saith unto them, " Woe be unto you, ye scribes and Pharisees, ye hypocrites :—ye are of your father the devil." In these examples we see, the Spirit of God can sometimes be hot and earnest against the deceivers of the people, and the professed enemies of the cross of Christ. Neither did either Esay the prophet, or John the Baptist, or Christ, defy the church of God and set it at nought, as M. Harding imagineth of us : but rather by these fervent speeches uttered the vehement zeal and just grief they had conceived against them, that under the name of the church abused God's people, and defaced the church.

Isa. i. 10.

Matt. iii. 7.

Matt. xxiii.

13.
John viii. 44.

For they are not all heretics, M. Harding, that this day

- espy your gross and palpable errors, and mourn to God for reformation. St. Augustine saith, *Non debet ovīs pellem suam deponere, quod lupi aliquando se ea contegant*: "It is no reason the sheep should therefore leave off his fleece, for that he seeth the wolf sometime in the same apparel ⁴⁵." Likewise it is no reason, that we should therefore give over the right and inheritance we have in the church of God, for that you by intrusion and unjust means have entituled yourselves unto the same. It behoveth us rather to search the scriptures, as Christ hath advised us, and thereby to assure ourselves of the church of God. For by this trial only, and by none other, it may be known. Therefore
- John v. 39. St. Paul calleth the church "the spouse of Christ," for that she ought in all things to give ear to the voice of the
- Ephes. i. 23. Bridegroom. Likewise he calleth the church "the pillar of the truth," for that she stayeth herself only by the word of God: without which word the church, were it never so beautiful, should be no church. The ancient father Ire-
- i Tim. iii. 15. næus saith,.....*Columna et firmamentum ecclesiæ est evangelium, et spiritus vitæ*: "The pillar and buttress of the church, is the gospel and the spirit of life." St. Augustine saith, *Sunt certi* [al. *certe*] *libri Dominici, quorum auctoritati utrique consentimus.....Ibi quæramus ecclesiam: ibi discutiamus causam nostram*: "There be certain books of our Lord, unto the authority whereof each part agreeth. There let us seek for the church: thereby let us examine and try our matters." And again, *Nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis, sanctam ecclesiam demonstrari*: "I will ye shew me the holy church, not by decrees of men, but by the word of God." Likewise saith Chrysostom, *Nullo modo cognoscitur quæ sit vera ecclesia Christi, nisi tantummodo per scripturas*: "It can no way be known what is the church, but only by the scriptures." And again: *Christus mandat, ut.....volentes firmitatem accipere veræ fidei, ad nullam rem fugiant, nisi ad scripturas. Alioqui si ad alia respexerint, scandalizabuntur, et*
- Augustin. lib. 2. De Sermon. Domini in Monte. [iii. pt. 2. 233.]
- Ireneus, lib. 3. cap. 11. [p. 190.]
- Augustin. de Unit. Eccles. cap. iii. [ix. 340.]
- Augustin. in eodem, cap. [ibid. 341.]
- Chrysost. in Opere Imperfecto, hom. 49. [vi. app. 204.]
- Chrysost. in eadem hom. [ibid. 205.]

⁴⁵ [Augustine. This was quoted "mentum suum, quia plerumque probably from memory, "Sed non "illo se occultant lupi."]
"ideo debent oves odisse vesti-

peribunt, non intelligentes, quæ sit vera ecclesia. Et per hoc incident in abominationem desolationis, quæ stat in locis sanctis ecclesiæ: “Christ commandeth, that whoso will have the assurance of true faith, seek to nothing else but unto the scriptures. Otherwise, if they look to any thing else, they shall be offended, and shall perish, not understanding which is the true church. And by mean hereof they shall fall into the abomination of desolation, which standeth in the holy places of the church.”

Dan. ix. 27.
Matt. xxiv.
15.

By these ancient learned fathers it is plain, that the church of God is known by God’s word only, and none otherwise. And therefore, M. Harding, you so carefully flee the same, and condemn it for heresy, and often burn it, lest thereby the deformities of your church should be known. For the ill-doer fleeth the light.

John iii. 20.

Now whereas it so well liketh M. Harding to call us all heretics, and for his pleasure’s sake to liken us to apes, to asses, and to the devil, notwithstanding we might safely return the same whole from whence it came, yet I think it not seemly nor greatly to purpose to answer all such intemperate humours. Solomon’s advice is good, Answer not folly with like folly. Notwithstanding, the poor simple ass, unto whom we are compared, was able sometime to see the angel of God, and to open his mouth, and to speak, and to reprove the lewd attempt of Balaam the false prophet. Whatsoever account it pleaseth M. Harding to make of us, by the grace of God we are that we are. If we be able to bear Christ with his cross, it is sufficient.

Prov. xxvi. 4.

Numb. xxii.
27, 28.

But who they be, that have of long time jetted so terribly under the lion’s skin, and, only with a painted vizard or empty name of the church, have feared all the cattle of the field, it is needless to speak it: the world now seeth it: it can no longer be dissembled. Even he, that lately bare himself as the lion of the tribe of Juda, and called himself “king of kings⁴⁶,” and said, “he had power over the angels of God⁴⁷,” and amazed the hearts of the simple with

Augustinus
Steuchus de
Primatu.

See the fifth
part hereof,
the 6th chap.
and 15th
division.

⁴⁶ [The Editor has not been able to find any work by Augustinus Steuchus de Primatu.]

⁴⁷ [Felinus super Decret. de Constit. Canonum Statuta. tom. i. fol. 9.]

the terror of his lion's pelt, only for that he sat in Peter's chair, is now revealed and better known, and esteemed as he is worthy: he may now jet up and down with more ease and less terror. And why so? These poor asses, whom M. Harding so much disdaineth, have stript off his counterfeit skin that made him so hardy, and have caused him to appear even as he is.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 1. Divis. 1.*

IT hath been an old complaint, even from the first time of the patriarchs and prophets, and confirmed by the writings and testimonies of every age, that the truth wandereth here and there as a stranger in the world, and doth readily find enemies and slanderers amongst those that know her not⁴⁸. Albeit perchance this may seem unto some a thing hard to be believed, I mean to such as have scant well and narrowly taken heed thereunto, specially seeing all mankind of nature's very motion without a teacher doth covet the truth of their own accord: and seeing our Saviour Christ himself, when he was on earth, would be called the Truth, as by a name most fit to express all his divine power: yet we, which have been exercised in the holy scriptures, and which have both read and seen what hath happened to all godly men commonly at all times: what to the prophets, to the apostles, to the holy martyrs, and what to Christ himself: with what rebukes, revilings, and despites they were continually vexed, whiles they here lived, and that only for the truth's sake: we, I say, do see, that this is not only no new thing, or hard to be believed, but that it is a thing already received, and commonly used from age to age. Nay truly, this might seem much rather a marvel and beyond all belief, if the devil, who is the

Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[sub init.]

[Vol. iv. p.
5.]

⁴⁸ [Tertullian. " . . . et inter extraneos facile inimicos invenire."]

father of lies and enemy to all truth, would now John viii. 44. upon a sudden change his nature, and hope that truth might otherwise be suppressed than by believing it: or that he would begin to establish his own kingdom by using now any other practices, than the same which he hath ever used from the beginning. For since any man's remembrance, we can scant find one time, either when religion did first grow, or when it was settled, or when it did afresh spring up again, wherein truth and innocency were not by all unworthy means, and most despitefully, entreated. Doubtless the devil well seeth, that, so long as truth is in good safety, himself cannot be safe, nor yet maintain his own estate.

For, letting pass the ancient patriarchs and prophets, who, as we have said, had no part of their life free from contumelies and slanders: we know there were certain, in times past, which said and commonly preached, That the old ancient Jews (of whom we make no doubt but they were the worshippers of the only and true God) did worship either a sow or an ass in God's stead, and that all the same religion was nothing else but sacrilege, and a plain contempt of all godliness. We know also, that the Son of God, our Saviour Jesus Christ, when he taught the truth, was counted a sorcerer and an enchanter, a Samaritan, Beelzebub, a deceiver of the people, a drunkard, and a glutton. Again, who wotteth not, what words were spoken against St. Paul, the most earnest and vehement preacher and maintainer of the truth? sometime, that he was a seditious and busy man, a raiser of tumults, a causer of rebellion: sometime again, that he was a heretic: sometime, that he was mad: sometime, that only upon strife and stomach he was

Cornel.
Tacit. Hist.
lib. 5. [cap.
4.]

Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[cap. 16. p.
15.]

both a blasphemer of God's law, and a despiser of the Father's ordinances. Further, who knoweth not, how St. Stephen, after he had thoroughly and sincerely embraced the truth, and began frankly and stoutly to preach and set forth the same, as he ought to do, was immediately called to answer for his life, as one that had wickedly uttered disdainful and heinous words against the law, against Moses, against the temple, and against God? or who is ignorant, that in times past there were some which reproved the holy scriptures of falsehood, saying, They contained things both contrary and quite one against another: and how that the apostles of Christ did severally disagree betwixt themselves, and that St. Paul did vary from them all? And, not to make rehearsal of all, for that were an endless labour, who knoweth not, after what sort our fathers were railed upon in times past, which first began to acknowledge and profess the name of Christ? how they made private conspiracies, devised secret counsels against the commonwealth, and to that end made early and privy meetings in the dark, killed young babes, fed themselves with men's flesh, and, like savage and brute beasts, did drink their blood! In conclusion, how that after they had put out the candles, they committed adultery between themselves, and without regard wrought incest one with another: that brethren lay with their sisters, sons with their mothers, without any reverence of nature or kin, without shame, without difference: and that they were wicked men without all care of religion, and without any opinion of God, being the very enemies of mankind, unworthy to be suffered in the world, and unworthy of life!

All these things were spoken in those days against

Hier. in Pro-
æmio in
Epist. ad
Galat. [iv.
223.]

Hier. in
Matthæ. lib.
1. cap. 1. [iv.
7.]

Tertull. con-
tra Marcion.
lib. 1. [p.
375.] et lib.
4. [414.]
lib. 5. cap. 2.
[p. 462.]
Lactant.

Euseb. lib. 5.
cap. 1. [1.
201.]

Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[pp. 7. 9.]

[cap. 7. 8.]

the people of God, against Christ Jesus, against Paul, against Stephen, and against all them, whosoever they were, which at the first beginning embraced the truth of the gospel, and were contented to be called by the name of Christians: which was then a hateful name among the common people. And although the things which they said were not true, yet the devil thought it should be sufficient for him, if at the least he could bring it so to pass, as they might be believed for true: and that the Christians might be brought into a common hatred of every body, and have their death and destruction sought of all sorts. Hereupon kings and princes, being led then by such persuasions, killed all the prophets of God, letting none escape: Esay with a saw, Jeremy with stones, Daniel with lions, Amos with an iron bar: Paul with the sword, and Christ upon the cross: and condemned all Christians to imprisonments, to torments, to the pikes, to be thrown down headlong from rocks and steep places, to be cast to wild beasts, and to be burnt: and made great fires of their quick bodies, for the only purpose to give light by night, and for a very scorn and mocking-stock: and did count them no better than the vilest filth, the off-scourings and laughing games of the whole world. Thus, as ye see, have the authors and professors of the truth ever been entreated.

Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[p. 4.]

Suetonius
Tranquill. in
Nerone.
[cap. 16.]

M. HARDING.

Who would not think, that these defenders were true men, that in the beginning of their Apology speak so much of the truth? Yet who knoweth not, that oftentimes evil meaning is hid under good words? who hath not heard, that filthy queans in time and place use the honest talk of chaste matrons? the thief commendeth just dealings, and many times sheweth a stomach against false harlots, no man more. Among all, none pretend truth in words

so much as heretics. "I fear me," saith St. Paul, "lest as the serpent beguiled Eve by his subtlety, so your wits be corrupted and fallen away from that plainness which is in Christ." The apostle feared because of the crafty Jews: who, the rather to deceive, mingled scriptures with their own traditions, and truth with falsehood. So bringeth the heretic his hearer to error in faith, by colour and pretence of truth.

They are much like to the Manichees, who promised their hearers to discuss and set forth the truth most evidently unto them, and to deliver them from all manner of errors. By which fair promises St. Augustine was allured to be a diligent scholar of theirs for the space of nine years.

Christ gave us a lesson how to discern them. "By their fruits ye shall know them," saith he. And now to you, Sirs. Even in the beginning, and, as I may say, in the forehead of your Apology, whiles I examine it diligently, I find two foul faults: the one in your rhetoric, the other in your logic. By which two faults, both the unskill of your secretary and the weakness of your matter may be espied, as the ass I spake of right now was by his two ears staring out under the lion's skin. Your divinity is nothing else in gross, but a lump of lies, errors, and heresies.

First, touching your rhetoric, amongst many faulty proems, one of the worst is that which is such as the adversary may use: which by them is called *exordium commune*, that is to wit, such a beginning as will serve the defendant no less than the plaintiff, or contrariwise. Of that sort is the beginning of your Apology. For declaring at large that truth hath ever been persecuted, what saith it therein (the faults amended) that we may not say the same? That shipmaster is accounted very bad, who, at the setting out of the haven, driveth the ship on the rocks.

Alleging Tertullian to help your cause, ye injury the doctor by altering his words. Ye were not wise, by falsifying the first sentence, so much to impair your credit. Tertullian saith not, "that truth readily findeth enemies and slanders amongst those that know her not," but, "that truth soon findeth enemies *extraneos*, amongst aliens and strangers." Now the Christian catholics, whom ye call papists, be not in respect of the truth aliens and strangers. For yourselves, in sundry places of your book, reprove them for resisting the truth which they know.

You have given Tertullian a new livery with your own badge, and have made exchange of *extraneos* with *ignotos*. Tertullian meant by aliens no other than infidels and paynims, among whom Christian people then lived, and were daily persecuted. But after the gospel had been sounded abroad by the apostles and their successors through all the earth, after that the emperors themselves, and all the people every where had received the faith, then was the truth no more a wanderer, stranger, or pilgrim in the earth.

De Utilita.
Credendi ad
Honoratum.
lib. 1. cap. 1.
[viii. 46.]
Confess. lib.
5. cap. 6. [l.
111.]
Matt. vii. 20.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Touching this comparison of whores and thieves, and other like M. Harding's ungentle speeches, as I have before protested, I will say nothing. He is very dumb and can speak but little, that cannot speak ill.

It is true, M. Harding, that you say : Most liars oftentimes pretend most truth : as, if there were none other example, may soon appear by the whole tenor and substance of your books. The devil himself, the better to sound his lies, beareth himself oftentimes as the angel of truth.

But the example that ye bring of the Jews, who, as you say, the rather to deceive, mingled scripture with their own traditions, and truth with falsehood, maketh most plainly against yourself. For you know, that this is the general complaint of all the godly this day throughout the whole church of God, That you have mingled your lead with the Lord's gold, and have filled the Lord's harvest full of your darnel : that you have broken God's manifest commandments, to uphold and maintain your own traditions : that you have dammed up the springs of the water of life, and have broken up puddles of your own, such as be able to hold no water : that for your dreams' sake you have caused the people to forget the name of God, and have led them from that "simplicity that is in Christ Jesus." This is the mingling of traditions with the scriptures of God. I marvel ye could so freely utter so much, and so directly against yourself.

As for the example of the Manichees, it was utterly impertinent and from the purpose. Yet, good reader, that thou mayest understand what manner of heretics these Manichees were, and what errors they defended : first they forbade lawful marriage, and allowed fornication, as M. Harding's catholics do now. So saith St. Augustine of them : *Nuptiarum aditus intercludunt, et promiscue convivire hortantur*⁴⁹.

See what is answered in the fourth part hereof, chap. i. div. 1. In Quæst. in Nov. Test. quæst. 72. [iii. app. p. 71.]

⁴⁹ [August. Quæst. in Nov. Test. This is not genuine.]

M. Harding,
fol. 81 a.
M. Harding,
fol. 81 b.

*Addition*⁵⁰. ¶ Hereunto M. Harding saith, “ You *Addition.*
slander us, M. Jewel, most unjustly and impudently. The
catholics never forbade lawful marriage. And it is known
to all the world, that fornication was never allowed in the
catholic church at any time or age. And the Manichees,
by your pretended proof out of St. Augustine, excluded all
men from marriage generally.” *The answer.* 1. To the
first part hereof I grant: lawful marriage was never for-
bidden in the catholic church, that is to say, in the whole
universal church throughout the world. For it is known
that the priests in India, Ethiopia, Africa, Asia, Græcia,
&c. have continued still in lawful marriage, from the be-
ginning unto this day, without any restraint or force to the
contrary. But in the church of Rome the marriage of
priests hath been and is forbidden. And the same in all
other churches is judged lawful, as it was also in the pa-
triarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and other holy fathers,
and generally in the whole primitive church of Christ.
Neither is it marriage, but the unlawful restraint of mar-
riage, that St. Paul calleth the doctrine of devils.

1 Tim. iv.
1—3.

2. Secondly, notwithstanding M. Harding say, “ Fornication was never allowed in the catholic church,” yet verily in the church of Rome it hath been allowed, as by good record and general practice it may appear. M. Harding himself calleth the open stews in Rome, “ a necessary ill for avoiding of other disorders that would be greater:” and so far forth he maketh them allowable by way of necessity. And further to this purpose in defence hereof unadvisedly he allegeth these words of St. Augustine: “ Take harlots away from among men, and ye fill all the country with ribaldry and villainy.” Unadvisedly, I say, he allegeth these words. For, when Augustine wrote the same, he was neither saint, nor bishop, nor priest, nor Christian man⁵¹. In the conclusion he saith unto us,

M. Harding's
Confut. 162 b.

M. Harding's
Confut. 162 a.

Augustin. de
Ordine. lib.
2. cap. 4.
[l. 335.]

⁵⁰ [These additions were first inserted in the edit. of 1570, in answer to Harding's “ Detection of sundry foul Errors in the Def. of the Apology,” published at Louvain 1568.]

⁵¹ [This is quite correct. St. Au-

gustine himself, in his *Retract.* cap. 3, alleges that he wrote this treatise “ per idem tempus inter illos qui de Academicis scripti sunt;” and cap. 1, that he wrote the *Liber de Academicis* “ non-
“ dum baptizatus.”]

“In good sooth, masters, ye are too young to control the city of Rome in her doings.” Here, M. Harding, I pray you tell us, wherefore may we not control the city of Rome in her open filthiness, unless in some special respects you think it lawful? In few words, touching the allowance and smoothing of fornication, the practice of the church of Rome is this: *Etsi notoria sit fornicatio presbyterorum,* M. Harding's Confut. 163 a. Dist. 32. Null. *tamen non propter eam abstinendum est ab officiis illorum:* “Yea, although the fornication of the priest be notorious, yet may no man therefore refrain from his service.” That thing is notorious, saith the law, that needeth neither accuser nor judge, but is clear and manifest of itself. And notwithstanding some of the canonists have written otherwise of fornication, yet by these words it is passed as a matter allowable. Johan. Andr.

3. Thirdly, whereas M. Harding saith, “The Manichees excluded not only their priests and clergy, but also generally all manner of men from the use of marriage, as thinking it in all men to be unlawful:” St. Augustine's manifest words to the contrary are able both to clear the poor Manichees in this behalf, and also to reprove his open error. These be his words: *Hic non dubito vos esse clamaturos, invidiamque facturos, perfectam castitatem vos vehementer commendare, non tamen nuptias prohibere,* M. Harding, 81 b. Augustin. de Moribus Manich. lib. 2. cap. 18. [i. 739.] *quandoquidem auditores vestri, quorum apud vos secundus est gradus, ducere atque habere non prohibentur uxores:* “Here I doubt not but you Manichees will make outcries upon us, and procure us displeasure. For you will say ye greatly commend perfect chastity, and yet for all that forbid not marriage: for your hearers, which are an inferior or second degree amongst you, are not forbidden to marry and have wives.” Likewise he writeth in an epistle unto Deuterius: *Auditores qui appellantur apud eos, et carnibus vescuntur, et agros colunt, et, si voluerint, uxores habent:* Augustin. epist. 74. [il. 848.] *quorum nihil faciunt illi qui vocantur electi:* “They, that among them be called the hearers, do both eat flesh and till their grounds, and, if they list, marry wives: of all which things they that be called *electi* do nothing.”

Now, good reader, examine thou a little these witnesses, and compare them together. M. Harding saith: “The M. Harding, fol. 81 b.

Manichees forbade all men from marriage, generally without exception." St. Augustine saith: "The Manichees forbade not their hearers, which were of their laity, to be married, nor thought it unlawful for them to have wives." They thought marriage unlawful only in their priests and ministers, which among them were called *electi*. And even so, as I said, do this day M. Harding's catholics. Wherefore, having himself misreported both St. Augustine and the Manichees, and also uttering so many untruths in one place, there was no cause why he should use this pitiful outcry in the end: "Behold, reader, how immoderately M. Jewel slandereth us." For, as it may hereby appear, it is the truth: it is no slander. ☞

Leo, serm. 4.
de Quadra-
gesima. [l.
216.]

Augustin.
epist. 19. [il.
191.]

Augustin.
contra Fau-
stum, lib. 32.
cap. 19. [viii.
401.]

M Harding,
220 b.

Secondly, they received and ministered the holy mysteries under one kind, contrary to the general order of the catholic church. And so doth M. Harding now.

Thirdly, they yielded more credit to their own devices than to God's holy word. And, whereas the scriptures were plain against them, they said, even as M. Harding saith, "The scriptures were falsified, and full of errors⁵¹."

Addition. ☞ Albeit indeed he dareth not so boldly by *Addition.* express words to challenge the scriptures; he thinketh it better skill rather to lay the fault in vulgar translations. And yet the worst translation that this day is commonly used, either in the English, or in the French, or in the Dutch tongue, as he himself well knoweth, is far better and truer than the old common translation in the Latin. ☞

Augustin. de
Morib. Ma-
nich. lib. 2.
cap. 15. [l.
729.]

Peregrinas
et exquisitas
fruges multis
fercu. is va-
riatas.

Augustin. de
Morib. Ma-
nich. lib. 2.
cap. 13. [l.
726.]

Fourthly, they abstained from flesh, and yet in their fast they had and used all manner delicate and strange fruits, with sundry sorts of spices in great abundance. They abstained from wine, and yet used other liquors more dainty and precious than any wine, and thereof drank while their bellies would hold. St. Augustine's words thereof be these: *Distenti et crepantes*. I leave the rest. Now judge thou, gentle reader, whether party seemeth to resemble the Manichees.

But, whereas he thus upbraideth us, "By their fruits ye shall know them:" verily whiles the bishop of Rome

⁵¹ [Harding (Detect.) denies that he ever said this.]

even in the city of Rome maintaineth his houses of ribaldry and open stews, and M. Harding is ready and able by his eloquence and divinity to defend the same, they have no just cause greatly to boast themselves of their fruits. Howbeit it may be thought Christ gave us this lesson, not thereby to try the true doctrine from the false, but a true professor from an hypocrite. Otherwise our lives must be tried by the gospel, not the gospel by our lives.

Now let us examine that horrible heresy that M. Harding hath espied in the rules of rhetoric, by which, saith he, the secretary's unskill is betrayed, even in the forehead of our book. This entry, saith M. Harding, touching the complaint of truth, is so indifferent and common to both the parties, that either may use it as well as other. Which kind of beginning, saith he, is called *exordium commune*, and by the learned in rhetoric is misliked as faulty. First of all, M. Harding, this seemeth to me a strange kind of beginning, in so deep a disputation of divinity, to make your first quarrel unto rhetoric. Belike for lack of better entry, ye thought it good to rush in as you might. Indeed either of us may seem to stand in defence of truth. I deny it not. For, as we have the substance and truth itself, so are you content to claim the name. And so far forth truth is common to us both. So the wicked heathens, Celsus and Antiphon, notwithstanding they published their books against the truth, yet they entituled the same *'Αληθῆ λόγον*, "the book of truth." St. Hierom saith, *Mendacium semper imitatur veritatem*: "Falsehood evermore beareth a show of truth." In this sort truth is common to either party.

Origen saith: *Veritas Christus, simulata veritas Antichristus*: "Christ is the truth itself: Antichrist is the truth counterfeit." All this notwithstanding, Christ refused not to use the same kind of entry that M. Harding so much misliketh: but said unto the Pharisees: "Ye seek to murder me, a man that have told you the truth." And St. Paul to the Romans saith: "They have turned the truth of God into falsehood." The like might I say of Tertullian, Cyprian, and other fathers. Yet, I trow, M. Harding will not therefore reprove either Christ, or Paul,

Origen. contra Celsum. lib. 3. [l. 447.] et lib. 4. [ibid. 519.]

In Hier. cap. 23. [l. iii. 640.]

Origen. In Matt. tract. 27. [l. iii. 852.]

John viii. 40.

Rom. i. 25.

or Tertullian, or Cyprian : nor say, they used such a beginning, as their adversaries might have used as well as they, and had forgotten their rules of rhetoric.

Loath I am so long to stand in so light a matter. But I marvel much, that M. Harding, being so great an artificer in so small cases, had no better eye to his own entry. For if in writing the defence of truth, it be a fault in rhetoric to begin with the ill-entreating and complaint of truth, what then may we think it to be in the defence of manifest and known error, to begin, as M. Harding doth, with whores, with thieves, with apes, with asses, with children of the devil, and with many other like unseemly scoffs and scorns? what rhetoric, what eloquence, what art, what skill is this? what orator ever used it? what rhetorician, what sophist, Greek or Latin, ever taught it? Verily this was sometime accounted an old rule in rhetoric, which it seemeth M. Harding had quite forgotten: *Scurrilis oratori dicacitas magnopere fugienda est*. This secretary's beginning, by M. Harding's own confession, is such as either party indifferently might well have used. But M. Harding's beginning is such as neither party with any modesty might have used.

Cic. de Orat.
lib. 2. [60.]

Cic. lib. 1.
[48.] De In-
ventione.
Argumentum
commune vi-
tiosum est.

M. Harding also might have remembered that the skilful in rhetoric, as they mislike *exordium commune*, so they also mislike *commune argumentum*, that is, a reason or proof so common, that it may indifferently serve both parties. Which kind of proofs if M. Harding would have weeded out of his books, he should have left very little to trouble the printer.

Where he saith in gross, that our Apology is nothing else but a lump of lies: the truth thereof, I trust, shall appear by this treaty. In the mean season, good Christian reader, it may please thee to consider, that M. Harding's mouth is no just measure in this behalf. For some men think it will oftentimes utter untruth without measure. But he saith we have falsified Tertullian's meaning, placing this word *ignotos* instead of *extraneos*, and so at our pleasure making exchange of words, and giving the old father a new livery, and thereby impairing our whole credit. A

great outcry in so small a matter. This great exchange of words is nothing so heinous as it is pretended. For both *ignotus* is *extraneus*, and *extraneus* also, in Tertullian's meaning, is *ignotus*. And M. Harding well knoweth, that Tertullian speaketh namely and only of such aliens and strangers as knew not the truth of God. Whether of these two words it shall like him to leave us, the sense is all one, it forceth nothing. If he will needs refuse this word *ignotus*, so that he receive the other word *extraneus*, and grant that he and his fellows be strangers to God's truth, it shall be sufficient.

Howbeit he addeth further, that they of his side are now no strangers, but know God, as his dear friends and kinsfolk. Even so said the Pharisees of themselves, *Nunquid et nos cæci sumus?* "What, be we blind too?" But Christ answered them, "If ye were blind, then had ye no sin. Now ye say that ye see: therefore your sin remaineth still." And again: "I am come to judgment into the world, that they that see may be made blind." And again: "The children of the kingdom shall be thrown forth into utter darkness." John ix. 40, 41.
John ix. 39.
Matt. viii. 12.

Yet further M. Harding saith: "After that the gospel had been sounded abroad by the apostles and their successors, then was the truth no more a stranger or a pilgrim in earth." Whereby he would closely conclude, that his church of Rome can never err. But this is too vain a paradise. For Daniel, speaking of the latter days, saith:

Veritas prosternetur in terra: "The truth shall be overthrown in earth." Chrysostom saith: *Abominatio desolationis stabit in sanctis locis ecclesiæ*: "The abomination of desolation shall stand in the holy places of the church." Dan. viii. 12.
[Vulg.]
Chrysost. in
Opere Imperfecto.
hom. 49. [vi.
app. 205.]

St. Augustine saith: *Usque ad hujus sæculi finem, inter persecutiones mundi, et consolationes Dei peregrinando procedit ecclesia*: "Until the world's end, the church goeth forward, as it were in a pilgrimage between the persecutions of the world, and the comforts of God." And again: *Tota civitas Dei peregrinatur in terris*: "The whole city Augustin. de Civitate Dei, lib. 18, cap. 51. [vii. 534.]
De Civit. lib. 19, cap. 27. [vii. 571.]

⁵² [Chrysost. in Op. imperf. supra, vol. i. 244, note ⁸³.]

of God" (which is the church) "is a stranger and a pilgrim in the earth." Verily as long as Satan the prince of darkness is prince of this world, so long the truth of God passeth in this world as a stranger: and being among strangers, as Tertullian saith, easily findeth enemies, and is ill-entreated. He saith further: *Cæterum unum hoc gestit, ne ignorata damnetur*: "This only thing truth desireth, that no man condemn her before he know her⁵³."

Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[p. r.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. Divis. 1.

Wherefore we ought to bear it the more quietly,^[Vol. iv. p. 7.] which have taken upon us to profess the gospel of Christ, if we for the same cause be handled after the same sort: and if we, as our forefathers were long ago, be likewise at this day tormented and baited with railings, with spiteful dealings, and with lies: and that for no desert of our own, but only because we teach and acknowledge the truth.

M. HARDING.

O blessed followers of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and Christ himself, that suffer so much persecution in your innocency, having deserved nothing at all, and only because ye acknowledge and teach the truth! But, Sirs, by your leave, how followeth this "wherefore" of your former common place so largely treated? This is your foul fault, which you make in your logic. How prove you this argument: The truth is persecuted, and the professors of the truth have ever been evil treated: wherefore we ought to bear it quietly, being likewise handled for the same cause, &c. If you make this argument, which ye seem privily to make, leaving out the minor, "The professors of the truth be persecuted for the truth's sake: we be professors of the truth: therefore we suffer persecution for the truth's sake:" if you say thus, we imbar you from your conclusion by denying your minor, which ye can never prove.

And if ye reason thus, which way also ye seem to use: "The professors of the truth suffer persecution: we suffer persecution: *ergo*, we are professors of the truth:" we grant, your minor is true: but your argument is naught. So might all heretics

⁵³ [Tertullian. in Apolog. sub init. "... Scit se peregrinam in
"terris agere; inter extraneos fa-

"cile inimicos invenire... unum
"gestit interdum, ne ignorata
"damnetur."]

say, and by that argument prove themselves right believers. Wherefore, until ye prove that ye succeed the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and Christ himself, in professing the truth, boast not, as ye do, of your forefathers. For not they whom ye name in your proem, but Huss, Wickliffe, Peter Bruse⁵⁴, Berengarius, Waldenses, Albigenses, Donatists, Arians, Manichees, and such the like heretics, justly condemned of the church, were your forefathers.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

M. Harding pretendeth logic, and endeth in sophistry. The argument we make, wherewith he playeth so pleasantly, is founded upon these words of Christ: "The scholar is not above his master, nor the servant above his Lord: if they have persecuted me, they will persecute you. All these things shall they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know neither my Father, nor me." The minor is this: We succeed the apostles and martyrs, and are the professors of the truth. Which minor, by M. Harding's judgment, we can never prove. But God's holy name be blessed for ever, the greatest part of Christendom this day seeth this minor is true, and that both we are the professors of God's known truth, and you the professors of manifest falsehood. Touching the Donatists and Manichees, and all other like condemned heretics and heresies, we utterly abhor them, even as the gates of hell. As for John Wickliffe, John Huss, Valdo, and the rest, for ought we know, and I believe, setting malice aside, for ought you know, they were godly men. Their greatest heresy was this, That they complained of the dissolute and vicious lives of the clergy, of worshipping of images, of feigned miracles, of the tyrannical pride of the pope, of monks, friars, pardons, pilgrimages, and purgatory, and other like deceiving and mocking of the people: and that they wished a reformation of the church. We succeed not them, nor bear their names. We succeed Him, whose word we profess: whose word, M. Harding, they of your side have so often condemned, and under a colour of false translation have burnt for heresy.

Matt. x. 24.
John xv. 20,
21.

Alphonsus de
Hæresibus.
[Pp. 572. 240.
303. 640. 578.
888. 996.]

Bartholom.
Abramus in
Concil. Fer-
rariën.

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding addeth further: "Wick-<sup>M. Harding,
82 b.</sup>

⁵⁴ [Petrus Brusiùs : an early Reformer, fl. A. D. 1150.]

liffe held, 'That a bishop being in deadly sin is no bishop : that God ought to obey the devil,' &c. These and other like errors were alleged against him forty years after he was dead, and could not be present to make his answer.

As touching the former of these two errors, we defend it not. But if it be an heresy, and an heresy so grievous as M. Harding maketh it, why then is not pope Zachary charged also with like heresy? For thus he writeth, as it may seem to none other purpose than Wickliffe did: *Quis sapiens judicabit [l. æstimet] eos esse sacerdotes, qui nec a fornicationibus abstinent?* "What wise man will reckon them to be priests, that abstain not so much as from fornication?" This saying is no less prejudicial, nor less maim to the clergy of Rome, than the other of Wickliffe. For it is recorded for matter of truth, *Pauci sine illo vitio inveniuntur*: "There are few priests found without that fault." And so by the judgment of the pope himself, in the whole multitude of the Roman clergy, we may happen to find not many priests. If this heresy be so horrible in the one, why is it so easily dissembled in the other?

The second error that here is noted, "That God ought to obey the devil," hath neither colour nor savour of any truth. It importeth, that God is weak and the devil omnipotent: or rather, that God is a creature, and the devil is God. Which blasphemy the devil himself would never have uttered. God be thanked, M. Harding can allege no such words out of any book written by Wickliffe, although he wrote many. The report of an enemy maketh no proof: neither is there any enemy so malicious, no not M. Harding himself, if he behold his own conscience, that will believe it. But alas, good Christian reader, were these the errors that so troubled the world, and caused so many archbishops, bishops, abbots and friars, to the number of one thousand and three hundred, to meet together in general council? No, certainly: there were other greater heresies that vexed them more. They said, that the pope and his clergy, by these new articles of transubstantiation, and other like phantasies, had deceived the people. They said, that in the holy sacrament, after the consecration, there remaineth still the very material substance of bread

Conc. [ed. Crabb.] tom. 2. Epist. Zacharie ad Bonifacium, p. 454.

Dist. 81. Maximilianus: in Gloss.

Concil. Constantinien.

and wine, as the ancient catholic learned fathers, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, Theodoretus, and others have said before them. They said, Christ is not in the sacrament really, or in fleshly manner, or by the natural presence of his body. They said, as the old learned fathers say, that the sacrament by nature is very bread, and that the same, by way of a figure, is Christ's body: and that undoubtedly these words, "This is my body," imply a figure, as well as these words, "John Baptist is Elias."

They said, It cannot be proved by the gospel, that Christ ever ordained the mass, as then it was used. They said, That a bishop excommunicating a clerk, appealing either to the king or to the parliament, is a traitor both to the king and his country. They said, It was great folly to put affiance in popes' pardons. They said, It is not necessary to salvation, to believe that the church of Rome is the head of all other churches, and that the pope is not the next and immediate vicar of Christ.

These were the causes that inflamed the bishops to so cruel displeasure, to burn John Huss at the council of Constance, contrary to the emperor's safe-conduct, and their own special promise: and, contrary to all humanity and sense of nature, to dig up and to burn the body of John Wickliffe, forty years after he had been buried. ➡

Hereof we form our argument in this sort: Christ the Son of God was persecuted, and carried as a lamb unto the slaughterhouse for speaking the truth: therefore it behoveth us for the same cause suffering the like, to take it with patience. So saith St. Peter: "Christ died for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps. —If we suffer patiently for doing well, this thing is thankworthy before God." So the holy father and martyr Ignatius comforted himself, when he was in the midst of his torments: *Jam incipio esse discipulus Christi*: "Now begin I to be Christ's disciple⁵⁵." So Tertullian: *Quid debeo,.....nisi sanguinem quem pro me fudit Filius Dei?*

⁵⁵ [Euseb. *Nûn ἀρχομαι μαθητῆς εἶναι*. St. Ignatius was not "in the midst of his torments," but in daily

expectation of them. The words occur in a letter "ad Romanos," given by Eusebius.]

Matt. v. 12.

“What thing owe I else, but the blood which the Son of God hath shed for me⁵⁶?” The like comfort in like cases Christ giveth to his disciples: “Rejoice ye,” saith he, “and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven. For thus have they persecuted the prophets that were before you.”

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 2. Divis. 2.*

They cry out upon us at this present every where, [Vol. iv. p. 7.] that we are all heretics, and have forsaken the faith, and have with new persuasions and wicked learning utterly dissolved the concord of the church :

M. HARDING.

Untruth.

If ye have forsaken the faith ye were baptized in : if ye be gone from the faith which St. Eleutherius, pope and martyr, the first apostle of Britain preached in this land by Damianus and Fugatius, within little more than one hundred years after Christ's death : if ye refuse the faith which Gregory the Great, that holy pope, caused to be preached to our ancestors the English nation, by Augustinus, Melitus, and other holy priests, and have thereby dissolved the unity of the catholic church, and leave not to maintain the doctrine whereby the same unity is dissolved : all this presupposed, we see not but that this cry made upon you is true : for then are ye heretics indeed.

Damianus and Fugatius first apostles of the Britons, Augustinus and Melitus of the English.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

As well this report of Eleutherius, as also the other, noted in the margin, of Augustine, that the one was the first apostle of the Britons, the other of the English, are both untrue. For it is certain, that the church of Britanny, now called England, received not first the faith from Rome. Lucius the king of this country had received the gospel of Christ, and was baptized well near one hundred and fifty years before the emperor Constantine : and the same Constantine the first christened emperor was born in this island. And notwithstanding Eleutherius the bishop of Rome, at the king's special request, sent hither Fugatius

Gildas, Polydorus. [Hist. Angl. lib. 2.]

⁵⁶ [“Quid autem Deo debeo, “guinem quem pro me Filius fudit
“sicut donarium Cæsari, nisi san- “Ipsius?”] Tertull.]

and Damianus to inform the bishops and clergy, and to bring things to better order, yet undoubtedly the church and faith of Christ had been planted here a long while before they came, either by Joseph of Arimathea: or, as Theodoretus writeth, by St. Paul the apostle passing this way into Spain: or, as Nicephorus saith, by Simon Zelotes⁵⁷: or by the Greeks: or by some others.

Theod. de
Cur. Græc.
Affectibus.
[Galsf. ed.
p. 341.]
Niceph. lib.
2. cap. 4.
[leg. 40. i.
202.]

Addition.

Addition. ¶ “Here M. Jewel,” saith M. Harding, “extremely belieth Theodoretus and Nicephorus.” *The answer.* The extremity of these so horrible lies standeth only in that I say, Paul the apostle and Simon Zelotes were in person within this island, and preached the gospel: which thing, whether it be true or no, it weigheth not greatly, I devised it not. It is alleged by Flacius Illyricus, Johannes Wigandus, and Matthæus Judex, and avouched by the authority of Theodoretus, and Sophronius the patriarch of Hierusalem. Their words be these: *Theodoretus*, lib. 9. *De curandis Græcorum affectibus indicat, Paulum e priori captivitate Roma dimissum Britannis, et aliis in occidente, evangelium prædicasse. Idem fere tradit Sophronius Hierosolymitanus patriarcha.* This therefore, good reader, is not so great extremity of lying, saving that it liketh M. Harding so to call it. I allege mine authors, and shew the places. What copies these learned men followed, I have not to answer.

M. Harding,
fol. 83 b.]

Centuria 1.
lib. 2. cap. 2.

Again, where I say Simon Zelotes arrived once into this island, and here planted the gospel, for proof thereof alleging the authority of Nicephorus, all this M. Harding hath likewise condemned for another extreme lie. Wherein whether of us two is more extremely deceived, I am content himself shall be the judge. The words of Nicephorus are these: *Simon Zelotes doctrinam evangelii ad occidentalem oceanum, insulasque Britannicas perfert*: “Simon Zelotes carried the doctrine of the gospel into the west ocean sea, and into the islands of Britanny.” If M. Harding

Niceph. lib.
2. cap. 40.
[i. 202.]

⁵⁷ [See vol. ii. p. 29, note ¹³, and pp. 74, 75, with notes ³⁵, ³⁶. ³⁹ See also the preface to the Defence, supra p. 115, 116.]

had weighed the matter better, he would not have been so ready in dealing of lies⁵⁸. ☞

As for our Augustine of England, for it was not St. Augustine the learned doctor, neither was he so godly a man as M. Harding maketh him: for as it may appear by that Galfridus writeth of him, he was cruel, disdainful, proud and arrogant, and no way meet to be called an apostle.

Galfrid. lib.
8. cap. 4.

Addition. ☞ Here M. Harding saith, I have, under the name of Galfridus, immoderately slandered that blessed apostle, for so he nameth him. *The answer.* But how blessed he was, and how like unto one of Christ's apostles, it may appear. Indeed all these words are not expressly uttered, neither by Galfridus nor by Beda. Howbeit, the whole effect thereof may soon be found. First, his pride was apparent, in that he, being a mere stranger, lately arrived, and unacquainted, disdained to stand up from his chair, or to shew any kind of courtesy to the bishops of this realm appearing before him at a synod: which thing, as Beda witnesseth, they judged to proceed of immoderate stateliness, and in contempt of them. Again, he shewed his cruelty, in that, as it is written in French by Thomas Gray⁵⁹, an old chronicler, being refused of the Christian Britons, he enflamed Ethelbertus, the king of Kent, to levy his power and to war against them, himself also being in company, as in the old Abstract of Chronicles it is recorded, and marching with him towards the slaughter. Of the bloody cruelty and extremity that there was shewed, Thomas Gray saith thus: "They had no more regard of mercy, than a wolf hath upon a sheep." Of the innocent Christian monks that there were slain, Galfridus saith thus: *Mille ducenti eorum, in ipsa die martyrio decorati, regni cælestis adepti sunt sedem*: "A thousand and two hundred of them, being that day honoured with martyrdom, ob-

Beda, lib. 2.
cap. 2.

Thom. Gray.

The Abstract
of Chroni-
cles.

Galfrid. lib.
8. cap. 4.

⁵⁸ [Harding's confident assertion probably arose from the false print in the marginal reference to Nicephorus before the Addition.]

⁵⁹ [Thos. Gray is mentioned in

Tanner's Bibliotheca, as having been quoted by Jewel. The Editor has not been able to ascertain whether his work *Scala Mundi* was printed.]

tained a seat in the kingdom of heaven." Now M. Harding, if they were saints and martyrs that so were murdered, what saint then was your Augustine, that was the raiser and procurer of that murder⁶⁰? ➡

Neither was he the first planter of the faith within this island. For the faith was planted here many hundred years before his coming. Tertullian saith of his time:

Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca subduntur Christo: "The countries of Britanny, which the Romans could never attain unto, are now subject to Christ." Origen

saith of his time: *Terra Britannicæ consensit in religionem Christi:* "The land of Britanny hath agreed to Christ's

religion." Athanasius of his time saith: *Episcopi..... Africæ universæ, Siciliæ, Sardinia, Hispaniarum, Galliarum, Britanniarum sese ad concilium contulerunt:* "The bishops of all Africa, Sicilia, Sardinia, Spain, France, and Britanny came thither to the council (holden at Sardica)." Constantinus the emperor in his time maketh mention of the Christian churches in Britanny. St. Hilary in his time entituled his letter in this wise: *Clericis Tolosanis, et provinciarum Britannicarum episcopis:* "To the clergy of Toulouse, and to the bishops of Britanny." Chrysostom of his time saith: *Et insulæ Britannicæ extra hoc mare*

⁶⁰ [See note ³³, supra vol. ii. p. 66. The Editor has to regret, that by an oversight he has there followed Jewel's error, instead of correcting it, in attributing the execution of the massacre to Ethelbert instead of Ethelfrid. The original mistake in Jewel probably arose from his confounding the account of Geoffry of Monmouth, a writer of mere fables, (who attributes the massacre to Ethelbert,) with the history of Bede. The effect of the mistake is to throw a greater air of probability over the imputation against Augustine. Ethelbert could hardly have been the agent in this cruelty without the advice or concurrence of Augustine; whereas Ethelfrid the pagan king of Northumbria was beyond the power of Ethelbert,

and not subject to Augustine's influence. On the whole, bishop Jewel would appear to have adopted the belief of Augustine's guilt without sufficient evidence. He does not seem to have been well acquainted with English antiquities in general, and in this case he has used without discrimination the first weapon which offered itself against the pretensions of the church of Rome. The truth is, we can afford to appreciate the apostle of England as he deserves, without giving the smallest advantage thereby to Rome; and we cannot afford to see an illustrious character vilified, to whom, though not the founder of the church in Britain, the church of England owes so great a debt of gratitude.]

Ann. Dom.
212.

Ann. Dom.
212.

Ann. Dom.
334.

Ann. Dom.
330.

Ann. Dom.
360.

Ann. Dom.
400.

Tertull. contra Judæos.
[cap. 7. p. 189.]

Origen. in Ezek. hom. 4. [iii. 370.]

Athanas. Apologia Secunda. [i. 123.]
Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib. 1. cap. 10. [iii. 35.]

Hilarius de Synodis. [p. 1149.]
Chrysost. in Homilia, Quod Christus sit Deus. [i. 575.]

sitæ, et in ipso oceano positæ senserunt virtutem verbi Dei :
 “The islands of Britanny being in the very ocean, far out
 of this our sea, have felt the power of God’s word.” Theo-
 doretus of the time of the emperor Jovinian saith thus :

Theod. Hist.
 Eccl. lib. 4.
 cap. 3. [iii.
 150.]

Huic fidei consenserunt omnes ecclesiæ, quæque in Hispania Ann. Dom.
sunt, quæque in Britannia : “To this faith have agreed all” 367.

the churches, both of Spain and of Britanny.” These
 records may seem sufficient, if it please M. Harding to
 receive them. And all and every of these lived sundry
 hundred years before the arrival of Melitus and Augustine.

If any man shall happen to reply, “The faith was then
 utterly rooted out by the invasion of the Englishmen being
 heathens,” that matter is already answered in my former
 reply to M. Harding. Certainly Beda saith, the queen of
 England was then christened, and that there were then in
 this realm seven bishops, and one archbishop, with other mo
 great learned Christian men.

Art. 3. div.
 24. [vol. ii.
 p. 74.]

Beda, lib. 1.
 cap. 26.

Beda, lib. 2.
 cap. 2.

As touching this Augustine, we are not bound to all his
 doings. Although M. Harding allow him apostolic au-
 thority, yet all his hests were not gospel. The church in
 his time was grown to much corruption, as it may many
 ways appear by sundry places of St. Gregory. Verily Beda
 saith, The bishops and learned Christians of this country
 utterly refused to receive this new apostle with his new
 religion. And yet were they right catholic and godly
 men.

Beda, lib. 2.
 cap. 26.

Galfridus,
 lib. 8. cap. 4.

And Galfridus saith, *Erant septem episcopatus, et archie-*
piscopatus religiosissimis præsulibus muniti, et abbatiae com-
plices, in quibus grex Domini rectum ordinem tenebat :
 “There were then in England seven bishoprics, and one
 archbishopric possessed with very godly prelates, and many
 abbies, in which the Lord’s flock held the right religion.”

M. Harding,
 fol. 83 b.

Addition. ¶ “Here,” saith M. Harding, “M. Jewel be- Addition.
 lieth Beda twice. First, he applieth that to the Englishmen,
 which he spake of the Britons, namely of seven bishops,
 and one archbishop,” &c. *The answer.* If there had been
 some error herein, yet M. Harding might have uttered it
 in more courteous manner. Howbeit indeed it is not so.
 I spake not one word of English bishops, but only of the

bishops of the Britons, who, as M. Harding well knoweth, as it may also appear by Galfridus and Beda, were then the bishops, and the only bishops, of this country.

“Yet is there here,” saith M. Harding, “another lie. M. Harding, fol. 84 a. For they refused to obey him as their archbishop: they refused not his religion.” Certainly, good reader, the words of Beda seem plain to the contrary. “The Britons,” saith he, “made answer, that they could not leave their ancient usages without the consent of their fellows.” They came to an holy man, and demanded his advice, whether at this Augustine’s request, they should forsake and give over their old traditions. He answered them, If he be a proud man, it is certain he is not of God, neither ought we to care for his word. In the end he saith: *Cunctis, quæ dicebat, contradicere laborabant*: “They withstood him in all that ever he said.” I trow, he said somewhat else, besides his archbishop and his pall: otherwise his head had been very ambitious.

But M. Harding addeth further, It is well known that I have seen a certain book, which he calleth the “Return of Untruths⁶¹,” and that one of the same was presented unto me at Oxford, at what time the queen’s majesty was there in progress. How well M. Harding is assured hereof, I cannot say. It may pass in company with the rest of his truths. I assure thee, good reader, there was never such book offered to me, neither at Oxford nor elsewhere, neither did I ever read one line thereof in all my life. ➞

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. Divis. 3.

That we renew, and, as it were, fetch again from hell the old and many a day condemned heresies: that we sow abroad new sects, and such broils as never erst were heard of: also that we are already

⁶¹ [The Return of Untruths against M. Jewel, Antw. 1566, was by Stapleton, a work purporting to be an answer to the first four articles of the Challenge. The censure in the note, vol. i. p. 164, requires qualification. Stapleton’s reply to the two first articles is addressed almost exclusively to Jewel’s marginal notes: in art. 3 and 4, he *professes* (see his preface) to answer the whole text of the Replie.]

Beda, lib. 2. cap. 2. *Præcis abdicare moribus, deferre suas traditiones.*

M. Harding, fol. 83 b.

[August, 1566.]

divided into contrary parts and opinions, and could yet by no means agree well among ourselves :

M. HARDING.

Sith that ye raise up again the heresy of Aërius in denying prayer for the dead, who was for the same accounted an heretic eleven hundred years past : sith that ye raise up the heresy of Manichæus that lived before him, in taking away freewill : sith that ye raise up the heresy of Vigilantius, in refusing to pray to saints, and to honour their holy relics, and to keep lights in churches to the honour of God, and many other heresies besides of old time condemned : sith that ye raise up the heresy of Berengarius in denying the presence of Christ's very body in the blessed sacrament of the altar : and sith that ye add to those mo heresies of your own, as the appointing of the supreme pastorship or regiment of the church, in all things and causes spiritual, to a lay-magistrate, the denying of the external sacrifice of the church, which we call the mass, the maintenance of the breach of vows, of poverty, chastity, and obedience : again, sith that your division into sundry sects can neither be dissembled nor defended, whereof we shall speak hereafter more largely : all these things, besides sundry other of like enormity, being true, as they be most true, this other cry made upon you is true.

That these
defenders
be renewers
of old here-
sies.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This heap is great in show, and light in substance. Touching Berengarius, gentle reader, for shortness sake I must refer thee to my former reply to M. Harding. Aërius the Arian heretic, the breach of vows, the dissension of judgments in religion, shall be answered, God willing, hereafter, each matter severally in his place. We flatter not our prince with any new imagined extraordinary power, but only give him that prerogative and chieftly, that evermore hath been due unto him by the ordinance and word of God : that is to say, to be the nurse of God's religion : to make laws for the church : to hear and take up cases and questions of the faith, if he be able : or otherwise to commit them over by his authority unto the learned : to command the bishops and priests to do their duties, and to punish such as be offenders. Thus the godly emperor Constantinus sat in judgment in a cause ecclesiastical, between Cæcilianus and Donatus a Casis Nigris, and in the end himself pronounced sentence. Greater authority than

Art. 5. div. 6.
[Supra, vol.
li. p. 343.]

Isa. xlix. 23.

Augustin.
contra Cres.
lib. 3. cap. 71.
[ix. 476.]

Constantinus the emperor had and used, our princes require none. This, I trust, hitherto is no great heresy.

St. Hierom reproved Vigilantius, for that he found fault with the vigils, or night wakes that then were used, with praying to saints, with worshipping of relics, with lights, and other such like weighty matters. Touching which whole controversy, Erasmus giveth this judgment: *In hunc ita convitiis debacchatur Hieronymus, ut plusculum in eo modestiæ cogar desiderare. Utinam argumentis tantum egisset, et a convitiis temperasset*: “Against this Vigilantius St. Hierom so railleth, that I want in him some piece of sobriety. I would rather he had dealt with arguments, and had spared his railing.”

Of prayer to saints and lights, we shall speak hereafter. Night wakes afterward were condemned, as I remember, in the council of Carthage, and so sentence given by the church with this great heretic Vigilantius against St. Hierom. Verily the fathers in a former council holden at Eliberis in Spain decreed thus: *Placuit prohiberi ne fœminæ in cœmiterio pervigilent: quia sæpe sub obtentu orationis scelera latenter committunt*: “It liketh us that women be forbidden to watch at the places of burial: for often, under pretence of prayer, privily they commit wickedness.” To be short, if Vigilantius were an heretic for reproving of night watches, why hath the church of Rome so long sithence condemned and abolished the same watches, agreeably to Vigilantius, and contrary to the judgment of St. Hierom?

Relics were subject to much villainy, and are well near worn out of themselves.

The Manichees among other their fantastical errors were wont to say, that the body of man was made not by God, but by the angels of the devil, which they called *gentem tenebrarum*, and that in man there be two souls of contrary natures: the one of the substance of God, the other of the substance of the devil: and that either soul continueth still as it is, and cannot alter: that is to say, that the good soul can never be ill, and that the ill soul can never be good. And in this sense they said, that man hath no freewill.

Erasm. in
Præfatio, in
Epistolam
Hieronym.
contra Vigi-
lian. [tom. iii.
55. ed. 1516.]

Concil. Eli-
beris, cap. 35.
[Mansi, ii.
11.]

Augustin. de
Continent.
cap. 9. [vi.
309.]

Augustin.
contra Duas
Ep. Pelagian.
lib. 2. cap. 2.
[x. 432.]

Augustin. ad
Quodvult-
deum, [viii.
17.]

All these and other like errors we abhor and detest, as frantic furies. We say that the soul of man is not the substance, but the creature of God : and that it may be changed from good to ill : from ill to good : that David may fall : that Paul may rise : that God giveth us a new heart, and a new spirit within our breasts.

But as touching the freedom of will and power of ourselves, we say, with St. Augustine, *O malum liberum arbitrium sine Deo* : “ O evil is freewill without God.” Again, *Liberio arbitrio male utens homo, et se perdidit, et arbitrium* : “ Man, misusing his freewill, spilt both himself and his will.” Again, *Quid tantum de naturæ possibilitate præsumitur ? Vulnerata, saucia, vexata, perdita est. Vera confessione, non falsa defensione opus habet* : “ What do men so much presume of the possibility of Nature ? It is wounded, it is mangled, it is troubled, it is lost. It becometh us rather truly to confess it, than falsely to defend it.” Again, *Liberum arbitrium captivatum, non nisi ad peccatum valet* : “ Freewill, once made thrall, availeth now nothing but to sin.” Again, *Quod bene vivimus, quod recte intelligimus, Deo debemus. Nostrum nihil est, nisi peccatum, quod habemus* : “ That we live well, that we understand aright, we have it of God. Of ourselves we have nothing, but only sin that is within us.”

The better to clear this whole case, I thought it good to use the mo words. Thus may we learn to know ourselves, and humbly to confess our imperfection, and to give the whole glory unto God.

Therefore to conclude, St. Augustine saith : *Nos volumus : sed Deus in nobis operatur velle. Nos operamur : sed Deus in nobis operatur et operari pro bona sua voluntate. Hoc nobis expedit et credere et dicere. Hoc est pium : hoc est verum : ut sit humilis, et submissa confessio, et detur totum Deo.* — *Tutiores vivimus, si totum Deo damus, non autem nos illi ex parte, et nobis ex parte committimus* : “ We will : but it is God that worketh in us to will. We work : but it is God that worketh in us to work, according to his good pleasure. This is behoveful for us both to believe and to speak. This is a godly, this is a true doctrine, that our

Augustin. de
Verb. Apost.
serm. 11. [v.
137.]

Augustin. in
Enchiridio,
cap. 30. [vi.
207.]

Augustin. de
Nat. et Grat.
cap. 53. [x.
153.]

Augustin. ad
Bonifac. lib.
3. cap. 8. [x.
404.]

Augustin. de
Verb. Apost.
serm. 10. [v.
842.]

Augustin. de
Dono Perse-
veran. lib. 13.
cap. 6. [cap.
13. x. 838.]

[Ibid. cap. 6.
x. 827.]

confession may be humble, and lowly, and that God may have the whole. We live in more safety if we give all unto God, rather than if we commit ourselves partly to ourselves and partly to him."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. *Divis.* 4.

That we be accursed creatures, and like the giants do war against God himself, and live clean without any regard or worshipping of God :

M. HARDING.

What ye be, God knoweth, and your own conscience should know. Our Lord amend both you and us. But to say somewhat to that your guilty mind imagineth the world to report of you, if they which take away and abhor the external sacrifice, wherein Christ according to his own institution is offered to his Father, make no war against God : if they which make Christ a minister of shadows, signs, tokens, and figures : they which fear not to break their solemn vows made to God, and defend the same as well done : they which assure themselves of their salvation, and therefore live dissolutely without due care and fear of God : if, I say, they be not cursed creatures, and like giants that war against God, then are ye clear of this charge.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

To answer ifs with ifs, and words with words, it were great folly. Therefore leaving the answer of vows and assurance of salvation to their several places, first we deny not the sacrifice of Christ. Christ only upon his cross is our whole and only sacrifice for sin, and beside him we have none other. Howbeit, I have spoken hereof more at large in my former reply to M. Harding.

Neither make we Christ, as it liketh M. Harding to say, a minister of signs and figures. We know that Christ is the fulfilling and perfection of the law, and that grace and truth are wrought by him. Yet nevertheless we say, that the sacraments of the new testament are signs and figures. The old father Tertullian expoundeth Christ's words in this sort : *Hoc est corpus meum, hoc est, Figura corporis mei* : "This is my body, that is to say, This is a figure of my body." St. Augustine saith : *Christus adhibuit Judam ad convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis suis commendavit et tradidit* : "Christ received Judas

In the 17th Art. [vol. lii. p. 328.]

John i. 17.

Tertull. contra Marcion. lib. 4. [cap. 40. p. 458.]

Augustin. in Psal. iii. [lv. 7.]

[Vol. iv. p. 8.]

Luke xxii. i Cor. xi.

Augustin.
contra Adi-
mantum,
cap. 12. [viii.
124.]

unto his banquet, whereat he delivered to his disciples the figure of his body and blood." And again: *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui*: "Christ doubted not to say, This is my body, whereas he gave a token of his body."

Art. 12. div.
16. [vol. iii.
p. 185.]

I leave other holy fathers of like words and sense well near innumerable. Yet were they neither giants nor rebels against God, nor accursed creatures. If they had never used these words, nor called the sacrament the figure or token of Christ's body, then might M. Harding have been bold to say somewhat, and to lead away his reader with a tragical exclamation of signs and figures. Howbeit, he himself, as I have shewed in my former answer, in the exposition of these words of Christ, "This is my body," and other like phrases incident unto the same, to avoid one usual and common figure, is forced to shift himself into thirty other unnecessary and childish figures: as knowing that not so much as his open untruths can well stand without figures.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. Divis. 6.

That we despise all good deeds: that we use no discipline of virtue, no laws, no customs: that we esteem neither right, nor order, nor equity, nor justice: that we give the bridle to all naughtiness, and provoke the people to all licentiousness and lust:

M. HARDING.

Ye teach men to fast for policy, not for religion. And by your statute of Wednesday's fast⁶², whosoever shall write or say, that forbearing of flesh is a service of God, otherwise than as other politic laws are, they shall be punished as spreaders of false news are and ought to be. When ye preach only faith, not to remove the merit of works before baptism, as St. Paul meant it, but also after baptism: when ye take away the sacrament of confession and absolution, give ye not the bridle to all naughtiness? Do not some of your gospelling maids of London refuse to serve, except they may have liberty to hear a sermon before noon, and a play at afternoon?

Fast for Policy, fol. 2. p. 2.
Epist. ad Rom.
Bridle given to lewdness by this new gospel.

⁶² [This was the act, 5 Eliz. c. 5. (sect. 14 and 40.) entitled, "An Act touching politic Constitutions for the Maintenance of the

Navy." The word used is not "fast," but "fishday." (See Stat. at large.) It is mentioned by Jewel "in his View of a Seditious Bull."]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I thought M. Harding had known a difference between fasting and abstinence, or choice of meats. True fasting is a religious work, ordained to testify our humility, and to make the flesh the more obedient unto the spirit, that we may be the quicker to prayer, and to all good works. But abstinence from this or that meat with opinion of holiness, superstitious it may easily make a man, but holy it cannot. St. Paul saith: *Cibus nos non commendat Deo*: "It is not meat that maketh us acceptable unto God." Again: "It is good to confirm the heart with grace, and not with meats: wherein they that have walked have found no profit.—The meat serveth for the belly, and the belly for the meat: the Lord will destroy them both." And again: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink." Likewise Christ saith: "The thing that entereth into the mouth defileth not the man."

Hereby it is easy to see, that fasting is one thing, and abstinence from flesh is another. The Nazarites in the Old Testament abstained not from flesh, and yet they fasted. Elias was fed with flesh, John the Baptist ate the flesh of locusts: and yet they both fasted. Socrates saith, That many Christians in the Lent season did eat fish and birds: many abstained until three of the clock in the afternoon, and then received all kinds of meat, either fish or flesh, without difference. Likewise Epiphanius saith: "Some eat all kind of birds or fowl, abstaining only from the flesh of four footed beasts." And yet they kept their Lent truly, and fasted as well as any others. Wherefore abstinence from any one certain kind of meat is not of itself a work of religion to please God, but only a mere positive policy. St. Augustine saith: *Non quero quo vescaris, sed quo delecteris*: "I demand not what thou eatest, but wherein thou hast pleasure." And St. Hierom saith of the Manichees: *Jejunant illi quidem: sed illorum jejunium est saturitate.....deterius*: "They fast indeed: but their fasting is worse than if they filled their bellies."

Of only faith and confession, we shall speak hereafter.

⁶³ ["Non ego quero, a quo cibo abstineas, sed quem cibum diligis."]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. *Divis.* 7.

That we labour and seek to overthrow the state of monarchies and kingdoms, and to bring all things under the rule of the rash inconstant people, and unlearned multitude : [Vol. iv. p. 8.]

M. HARDING.

Can monarchs and princes seem to be maintained by your sects, who teach the people to rebel for pretended religion ? Allow ye the monarchy of the Roman empire, who so much complain in your Apology, that the pope made Charlemagne emperor of the west ? Hath the queen of Scotland cause to praise the proceedings of your gospel, through occasion whereof she ruleth not her subjects, but is rather ruled of her subjects ?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here is another great untruth among the rest. For M. Harding right well knoweth, that we never armed the people, nor taught them to rebel for religion against the prince. If any thing have at any time happened otherwise, it was either some wilful rage, or some fatal fury : it was not our counsel : it was not our doctrine. We teach the people, as St. Paul doth, to be "subject to the higher powers," "not only for fear, but also for conscience." We teach them, that whoso striketh with the sword by private authority, "shall perish with the sword." If the prince happen to be wicked, or cruel, or burthenous, we teach them to say with St. Ambrose, *Arma nostra sunt (preces et) lachrymæ* : "Tears and prayers be our weapons." Notwithstanding, what rebellion hath been moved in England by some of your side, in the late reigns of king Henry the Eighth and king Edward the Sixth, in defence of your religion, ye may well remember.

Rom. xiii. 1.
5.

Matt. xxvi.
52.

Ambrosius.
[ii. 864.]

M. Harding,
fol. 84 b.

Addition. ☞ Here M. Harding hath shortly shuffled together a whole troop of words, written or spoken by Luther, Melancthon, or others, in some part true, in most part false, and quite racked from their meaning : but in no part touching any part of our doctrine. Neither doth any of all these teach the people to rebel against their prince, Addition.

but only to defend themselves by all lawful means against oppression, as did David against king Saul. So do the nobles in France at this day. They seek not to kill, but to save their own lives, as they have openly protested by public writing unto the world. As for us, we are strangers unto their cases. They themselves are best acquainted with the laws and constitutions of their country: and therefore are best able to yield account of the grounds and reasons of their doings. But let M. Harding shew us, in so many kingdoms and countries that have withdrawn themselves from the obedience of the pope, what one prince hath there ever been removed for religion's sake by the professors of the gospel. There may he find the very pattern and practice of our doctrine. Perhaps many good princes may be found, that have been removed by the pope, and by others of his devotion.

I will not speak of enterprises attempted within this country. And yet is it known what hath been done, and at whose beck, and in whose behalf.

But forasmuch as you say, "We openly protest before God and the world, that we condemn and defy all such attempts. I mean, that any subject or subjects whatsoever of their own private authority, should take arms against their prince for matters of religion:" how like you then the attempts of Thomas Arundel the archbishop of Canterbury, against Richard the Second, king of England? You will say, It was no matter of religion: yet can you not say, but the said archbishop was a subject, and king Richard was his prince. How like you the late insurrection of the north, in the time of king Henry the Eighth? who kindled that fire? who raised that tempest? whose right was attempted? whose crown was assaulted? had protestants the leading of those bands? was Wyat the general of that field? how like you the council of cardinal Pole, in his imagined oration to Charles the emperor, calling back his majesty from the Turk, to leave all other affairs, and to bend his banners against England, and encouraging the subjects of this realm boldly to rebel against their prince? "There be in England," saith he, "whole legions of men, that have not bowed their knee to Baal."

M. Harding,
fol. 87 a.

Fabian, pt. 7.

Reginaldus
Polus, [Eccle-
Unit, De-
fens.] lib. 3.

If thou once arrive there, O emperor, God will bring them to thy hand. Englishmen are a people that oftentimes have deposed their kings for lighter causes, &c. They have still the same courage, &c. Nothing stayeth them from revenging so great wrongs by their king committed, but only the waiting for your majesty, &c." The book is abroad in print, and may be seen. I shew you only a few examples out of the heap: and, for that they be odious, I have rather touched them shortly than laid them open.

Nic. Machiavellus Florent. [lib. 1.]

Nicolas Machiavel in his Italian history saith, that the bishops of Rome themselves, through their ambition and cruelty, have raised such deadly discord and bloody wars between Christian princes, as few the like have been seen in Christendom these many years. Yet will you protest openly against them all? against your archbishops, against your cardinals, and against the pope himself, the successor of Peter, and the vicar of Christ? will you condemn and defy their attempts before God, and before the world? how then, if the pope this day, to recover his losses, would release the natural subjects of this realm from their oath and allegiance to the queen's majesty, as he hath often done, as well here as in other countries, and saith, "He may justly do it by the right of his office?" what would you then do yourself, M. Harding? or what would you advise your friends to do? why should you dissemble? you would do, even as your fathers have done before you.

15. q. 6. Nos. Sanctor. Ead. Alius.

But what mean you to deal so nicely in this matter? You say, "You protest before God and the world, you condemn and defy all such attempts." A man would think ye spake in earnest. Wherefore then have you set so favourable a construction to these words? "I mean," say you, "that any subject or subjects whatsoever, of their own private authority, should take arms against their prince for matters of religion." Wherefore except you only the case of religion? is it lawful, by your judgment, for the subject in any other case, either of life or of government, to arm himself against his prince? and would you thus persuade the people? is this your religion? is this your doctrine?

M. Harding, fol. 87 a.

Or what mean you "by their own private authority?"

May then the subject arm himself against his prince, by the common advice and by the public authority of the realm? if so, wherefore then blame you the nobles of Scotland? for whatsoever was done there, a few only excepted, was done by the consent and agreement of the whole. But perhaps by private authority you mean, whatsoever is attempted in this behalf, without the authority of the pope: to whom you have given the right and authority of both swords, spiritual and temporal: and from whom, you say, the kings and princes of the world have received their power. Verily the pope himself saith: *Materialis gladius stringendus* [l. *exercendus*] *est manu regum et militum, sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis*: "The material or temporal sword must be drawn by the hands of kings and soldiers" (howbeit, not by the prince's own authority, but) "at the beck and patience of the priest:" by which priest is meant the pope. And whatsoever is done at his beck, hath authority sufficient, and is well done. But great was the patience of the princes and powers of the world, that could so long and so quietly bear his becking.

M. Harding's
Confut. fol.
247 b. 248 b.

[Extrav.
Comm.] De
Majorit. et
Obedient.
Unam sanct.

Now, M. Harding, if you think it lawful for subjects to draw the sword in defence of the pope, why may you not also think it lawful for them to defend themselves in defence of Christ? ➡

The displacing of the emperor of Constantinople, and the placing of Charlemagne the French king, serveth M. Harding to small purpose: unless it be to disclose the pope's conspiracy against the emperor. Certainly, as any man may sensibly see, it was the advancing of the pope, the strengthening of the Saracens, and after of the Turks, and the division and dissolution of the state of Christendom. Platina saith: *Ab hoc tempore periit et potestas imperatorum, et virtus pontificum*: "After this time the power of the emperors, and the holiness of the pope, were both lost⁶²."

Platina in
Adrian. 2.

Touching the queen of Scotland, I will say nothing:

⁶² [No such passage occurs in the life of any of the six popes, who bore the name of Adrian, by Platina (ed. 1551). There is a passage resembling it in Vita Formosi (A. D. 891. 896).]

the kingdoms and states of the world have sundry agreements and compositions. The nobles and commons there, neither drew the sword, nor attempted force against the prince. They sought only the continuance of God's undoubted truth, and the defence of their own lives against your barbarous and cruel invasions. They remembered, besides all other warnings, your late dealing at Vassei, whereas great numbers of their brethren were suddenly murdered, being together at their prayers in the church, and holding up their innocent hands to heaven, and calling upon the name of God. Ahab said sometime to the prophet Elias : " Thou art he that troublest the whole country of Israel." But Elias made him answer : " It is not I that trouble the country : it is thou, and thy father's house, which have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and have followed after Baalim."

At Vassei,
ann. 1562.
[Thuani
Hist. lib. 29.]

1 Kings xviii.
17.

Addition. ¶ " What is a lie," saith M. Harding, " if this be none?" *The answer.* Indeed the nobles and commons of Scotland were in the field : we deny it not. So was David in the field against king Saul. They stood in armour, not to invade or attempt force against their prince, but only to defend themselves, as by way of retire. And therefore they withdrew themselves with their power into the marches of England, not for want of strength or courage, (for they had then double mo men in the field than came against them,) but only for reverence of their prince that came upon them : lest they should be forced by rage of their enemies and fury of war to strike the anointed of the Lord. Such broils have often happened in many countries, as by sundry stories it may appear. ¶

Acts v. 29.

Psal. cxviii.
9.

Psal. cxlvi. 4.

The subject is bound to obey his prince : howbeit, not in all things without exception, but so far as God's glory is not touched. These nobles had learned of St. Peter, " It is better to obey God than man:" and of the prophet David : " Better it is to trust to God, than to trust in princes." For they are mortal, and shall die : their spirit shall be taken from them, and then shall they return into the earth. Neither may a godly prince take it as any dishonour to his estate, to see God obeyed before him. For

he is not God, but the minister of God. Leo saith : *Christus quæ Dei sunt, Deo, quæ Cæsaris sunt, Cæsari reddenda constituit, &c. Hoc est vere non impugnare Cæsarem, sed juvare* : “ Christ commanded, that is due unto God, to be given to God : that is due unto Cæsar, to be given to Cæsar. Verily this is not to rebel against, but to help Cæsar.” Likewise St. Ambrose, being himself in manner a captain unto the people in God’s quarrel against Valentinian the emperor : *Quid præsentius dici potuit a Christianis viris, quam id, quod hodie in nobis [l. vobis] Spiritus Sanctus loquutus est ? Rogamus, Auguste, non pugnamus : non timemus, sed rogamus ?* “ What could be more boldly spoken of Christian men, than that the Holy Ghost spake in you this day ? (Thus ye said,) We beseech thee, noble emperor, we fight not. We fear thee not, but we beseech thee.”

Leo de Passione Dom.
serm. 10. [l. 269.]

Ambros. lib.
5. epist. 33.
[il. 855.]

To conclude, the queen of Scotland is still in quiet possession of her estate : and is obeyed of her subjects, so far as is convenient for godly people to obey their prince.

Addition.

Addition. ¶ “ Here,” saith M. Harding, “ what will you stick to say or write, which do say, write, and set out in print such a palpable and manifest falsehood : such, I say, as even the tankard-bearers in London can witness against you ?” *The answer.* At the time of the writing and first entry into the printing of my book, these words were true. For then was the queen of Scotland in the full possession of her estate. Neither could I prophesy, what things would follow. Shortly afterward the whole case was altered, as it is known. In the end of the print, by forgetfulness, this place escaped my hands without correction, and so slipped away unawares, as it was printed at the first. Indeed, as I could not foresee the restraint of the said queen’s liberty which followed, but wrote of her state as it then presently was, as indeed doing truly I could do none other : so could I not foresee the causes that occasioned that alteration. For, that the king should shortly after the time of my writing be so murdered, and the house wherein he lodged blown up with powder : that a wicked man, accounted the certain author of that parri-

cidial murder, having himself a wife yet living, should attain to the marriage of the same queen, whose husband he had so traitorously slain, were things unknown unto me, and unto all men also when I did write this: and what way the nobles and body of the realm would take for the safety of the young prince, who seemed to all men to be in great danger, was likewise unknown unto me. And M. Harding knoweth right well, that these were the occasions of the alteration of the state, from that it was when I did write, and not religion, which might well be known by that, that many of the said queen's religion were against her, and many protestants were and are her friends. And it seemeth, that M. Harding so "openly protesting before God and the world, that they condemn and defy such attempts, that any subjects should of their own private authority take arms against their prince," by his excepting of matters of religion only, should think it reason that parricides, murders, and shedding of blood, especially blood royal, rapes, incests, and such like, should not pass without all controlment. Surely God hath not suffered such great faults to escape unpunished even in princes, as doth well appear by the examples of queen Jezabel in Israel, queen Johanne⁶³ in Naples, king Tarquin in Rome: whom for their great wickedness God, by stirring their own subjects against them, deprived of their princely estates. For princes also are God's subjects, against whom, for their offences against his Majesty, he proceedeth, as well as against the basest sorts of men, by such ways as to his heavenly wisdom it seemeth good. ➞

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 2. Divis. 8.*

That we have seditiously fallen from the catholic^[Vol. iv. p. 8.] church, and by a wicked schism and division have shaken the whole world, and troubled the common peace and universal quiet of the church: and that, as Dathan and Abiram conspired in times past against Moses and Aaron, even so we at this day

⁶³ [The infamous queen of Naples, hanged on the very spot where she had strangled her first husband, A. D. 1381.]

have renounced the bishop of Rome, without any cause reasonable :

M. HARDING.

Before Luther's time all Christian people came together peaceably into one church, under one head, as sheep into one fold under one shepherd, and so lived *unanimis in domo*, "in one accord:" but after that Satan, who at the beginning beguiled Eve, had persuaded some to taste of the poisoned apple of Luther's new doctrine, "they went out from us, who were not of us, (for if they had been of us, they had remained with us,)" forsook the catholic church of Christ, sorted themselves into synagogues of Antichrist, withdrew themselves from obedience toward their pastor and judge, and sundered themselves into divers sects. This schism, division, and conspiracy against the head shepherd, is no less wicked, than that of Dathan and Abiram against Moses and Aaron was. For as God commanded Moses and Aaron to be obeyed of the children of Israel, so Christ commanded all his sheep to obey and hear the voice of him, whom in Peter, and succeeding Peter, he made shepherd over his whole flock.

Division and schism followed upon Luther's preaching.
1 John ii.

Numb. vi.

Great untruths.

John xxi.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Before the time that God's holy will was, that doctor Luther should begin, after so long time of ignorance, to publish the gospel of Christ, there was a general quietness: I grant, such as in the night season, when folk be asleep. Yet, I think, to continue such quietness, no wise man will wish to sleep still.

Ye say, "They have forsaken the catholic church: they went from us, who were not of us." Nay rather, M. Harding, we are returned to the catholic church of Christ: and have forsaken you, because you have manifestly forsaken the ways of God. But what if a man would a little put you friendly in remembrance? Sir, it is not so long sithence yourself were out of your own catholic church: and so were gone out from yourself: because yourself were not of yourself. For if yourself had been of yourself, you would have remained better with yourself. It is no wisdom, in carping others, to offer occasion against yourself. I beseech God to give you grace, that you may *redire ad cor*, and return again to yourself. But here you

bring in a great many untruths in a throng together. You say, that, as God commanded the people of Israel to obey Aaron, so Christ commanded all his sheep to obey the pope succeeding Peter: you say, Christ made the pope shepherd over his whole flock: you call him our pastor, and our judge: you call him the head shepherd: and for proof hereof, for some countenance of truth, ye allege the one and twentieth chapter of St. John, in which whole chapter notwithstanding, ye are not able to find, neither any such commandment of Christ: nor any mention of Peter's successor: nor all his sheep: nor shepherd over his whole flock: nor our pastor: nor our judge: nor our head shepherd. It is much to report untruth of a man. But to report untruth of Christ, and of his holy word, and that willingly and wittingly, and without fear, some men think it to be the sin against the Holy Ghost.

As for these words, "Feed my sheep, feed my lambs," they pertain as well to other the apostles as to Peter.

Matt. xxviii.
19.

Christ said generally to all his disciples, "Goye into all the world, and preach the gospel." And Paul saith of him-

1 Cor. xv. 10.

self, *Ego plus omnibus laboravi*: "I have taken more pains" (and more fed the flock) "than all the rest." Surely methinketh it is a weak kind of reasoning to say thus, Christ bade Peter feed his sheep, *ergo*, he made him head shepherd over all the whole world.

But if this whole prerogative hang of feeding the flock, what then if the pope feed not? what if he never mind to feed, as thinking it no part of his office? To conclude, what if he be utterly ignorant, as many have been, and cannot feed? yet must he needs be the head shepherd over the whole flock? and must all the sheep obey him, and hear his voice, that cannot speak? Verily, St. Augustine saith: *Qui hoc animo pascunt oves Christi, ut suas velint esse, non Christi, se convincuntur amare, non Christum, vel gloriandi, vel dominandi, vel acquirendi cupiditate*: "Who-soever they be, that feed the sheep to the end to make them theirs, and not Christ's, they love themselves, and not Christ, for desire either of glory, or of rule, or of gain."

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
123. [iii. pt.
2. 817.]

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 2. Divis. 9.*

[Vol. iv. p. 8.]

That we set nought by the authority of the ancient fathers and councils of old time: that we have rashly and presumptuously disannulled the old ceremonies, which have been well allowed by our fathers and forefathers many hundred years past, both by good customs, and also in ages of more purity: and that we have by our own private head, without the authority of any sacred and general council, brought new traditions into the church: and have done all these things not for religion's sake, but only upon a desire of contention and strife. But that they for their part have changed no manner of thing, but have held and kept still such a number of years to this very day all things, as they were delivered from the apostles, and well approved by the most ancient fathers.

M. HARDING.

Councils.

Ceremonies
of the church
abolished by
the gospellers.

The ancient fathers are but men, if they please you not. But if ye find any colour of advantage but in the new schoolmen, ye make much of it. So that your own opinion is the rule to esteem them, or despise them. Councils ye admit, as your fancy and pleasure leadeth, sometimes three, sometimes four, sometimes five or six. But all ye would never admit: and yet so many as are general and have been confirmed by the see apostolic, they are all of like authority. Concerning ceremonies, if ye shew us not the use of chrism in your churches, if the sign of the cross be not borne before you in processions and otherwheres used, if holy water be abolished, if lights at the gospel and communion be not had, if peculiar vestments for deacons, priests, bishops be taken away, and many such other the like: judge ye, whether ye have duly kept the old ceremonies of the church.

As for your new traditions, rites, and ceremonies, I cannot tell what to make of them, nor whether I may so term them.

No manner of thing have we changed, that is of necessity either to be believed or to be observed.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We allow the ancient fathers the same credit that they themselves have ever desired. St. Augustine hereof writeth

Augustin. ad
Fortunat.
epist. 111.
[ii. 502.]

thus : *Neque quorumvis disputationes, quantumvis catholicorum, et laudatorum hominum, velut scripturas canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat, salva reverentia [leg. honorificentia], quæ illis debetur, aliquid in illorum scriptis improbare, aut respuere, si forte invenerimus, quod aliter senserint, quam veritas habet..... Talis sum ego in scriptis aliorum : tales volo esse intellectores meorum :* “ We receive not the disputations or writings of any men, be they never so catholic or praiseworthy, as we receive the canonical scriptures : but that, saving the reverence due unto them, we may well reprove or refuse some things in their writings, if it happen we find they have otherwise thought, than the truth may bear them. Such am I in the writings of others : and such would I wish others to be in

Augustin. ad
Hieronym.
epist. 19. [ii.
190.]

mine.” Likewise he writeth to St. Hierom : *Non puto, frater, te [sic] velle libros tuos legi, tanquam apostolorum, aut prophetarum :* “ I reckon not, my brother, that ye would have us so to read your books, as if they were written by the apostles or prophets.” It is certain, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Papias, Irenæus, Victorinus, Lactantius, Hilarius, and other ancient fathers

Picus Miran-
dula in Apol.

were oftentimes much deceived. St. Hierom scoffeth at St. Ambrose’s Commentaries upon Luke, and calleth them *nugas*, “ trifles,” and nicknameth St. Ambrose, sometime calling him *Corvus*, sometime *Cornicula*. Likewise St. Augustine saith : *Ecclesiastici judices, ut homines, plerunque falluntur :* “ The judges or doctors of the church, as being men, are often deceived.” And Thomas of Aquine saith :

Augustin.
contra Cre-
scentium, lib.
2. cap. 2. [leg.
cap. 21. ix.
423.]

Picus Miran-
dula in Apol.
Thomas in
Quodlibet 9.
Art. ultimo.

Non tenemur de necessitate salutis, credere non solum doctoribus ecclesiæ, ut Hieronymo aut Augustino, sed ne ipsi quidem ecclesiæ, nisi in his quæ pertinent ad substantiam fidei : “ We are not bound upon the necessity of salvation to believe not only the doctors of the church, as Hierom or Augustine, but also neither the church itself, saving only in matters concerning the substance of faith.”

Touching the authority of councils, St. Augustine saith :

Augustin.
contra Dona-
tist. lib. 2.
cap. 3. [ix.
98.]

Ipsa plenaria concilia sæpe priora a posterioribus emendantur, cum aliquo experimento aperitur, quod clausum erat : “ The very general councils are often corrected, the

former by the later, as often as by trial and experience the thing is opened that before was shut." Likewise Panormitane saith: *Plus credendum est uni privato fidei, quam (toti concilio et) papæ, si meliorem habeat auctoritatem, vel rationem*: "We ought to give more credit to one private layman than to the whole council and to the pope, if he bring better authority and more reason⁶²." If the council be wicked, and carried with malice, as many have been, specially within these few late hundred years, we say, as the prophet Esay saith: *Inite consilium, et dissipabitur: loquimini verbum, et non stabit: quia nobiscum est Dominus*: "Take counsel together, and it shall be broken: speak the word, and it shall not hold. For the Lord is with us."

Abb. Panorm.
de Electio. et
Electi potest.
cap. Signifi-
casti. [i. fol.
108. col. 1.]

I sa. viii. 10.

As for the late school doctors, yourselves weigh them as little, as no man less. You say in your common talks, *Bernardus non vidit omnia*: you have controlled your doctor of all doctors, Peter Lombard, with this common caveat in the margin, *Hic magister non tenetur*: "Here our doctor is no doctor." You yourself, M. Harding, in this your very book against our Apology, say, that your doctor Gratian was deceived, and instead of Anacletus alleged Calixtus. You yourself again say, "If in a secret point of learning St. Augustine or St. Cyprian teach singularly, we follow them not: much less do we bind ourselves to believe whatsoever Albertus Pighius hath written." And again: "We bind ourselves neither to the words of Sylvester nor of Pighius." And again: "We take not upon us to defend all that the canonists or schoolmen say or write." And another of your company saith, that your doctor Gratian hath published great untruths, and wilfully falsified the general council. *Nomen universalis*, saith he, *assutum est a Gratiano*⁶³. Thus, M. Harding, ye use your doctors, even as the merchant useth his counters: sometime to stand for an hundred pounds, sometime for a penny.

M. Harding
fol. 92 b.

M. Harding
fol. 232 b.

M. Harding
fol. 258.

Copus, Dia-
log. i. p. 33.

But now let us a little examine the particulars of your

⁶² [The substance of Panormitane's words.]

⁶³ [Copus. The real author of these six Dialogi, (which Cope

edited,) was Nic. Harpsfeld, the same who disputed with archbishop Cranmer.]

bill. Ye come in with processions, with lights, with torches, with tapers, with chrism, with oil, with tunicles and chisibles, with holy water and holy bread, and I know not what else : as if all these things had descended directly from the apostles, and without the same the church of God were no church.

Verily, M. Harding, we hate not any of all these things: for we know they are the creatures of God. But you have so misused them, or rather so defiled and bewrayed them with your superstitions, and so have with the same mocked and deceived God's people, that we can no longer continue them without great conscience. I will pass over the rest, and speak only of your oil, whereof you seem to make most account. In your Pontifical thus are ye taught to bless your oil: *Fiat Domine hoc oleum, te benedicente, unctio spiritualis ad purificationem mentis et corporis*: "O Lord, let this oil, by thy blessing, be made a spiritual ointment to purify both soul and body⁶³." And again: *Emitte quæsumus, sancte Pater, Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum tuum de cælis in hanc pinguedinem olivæ, ad refectionem corporum, et sanationem animarum*: "O holy Father, we beseech thee, send down thy Holy Spirit the Comforter from heaven into this fatness of the olive, to the refreshing of body and soul⁶³." In like sort ye are taught to pray over the sick: *Per hanc sanctam unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam ignoscat tibi Deus, ut per hanc unctionem habeas remissionem omnium peccatorum*: "By this holy anointing, and by his great mercy, God pardon thee, that by this anointing thou mayest have remission of all thy sins⁶³." These things cannot be denied: they are written in all your manuals, used and practised in all your churches. Ye call it holy oil, and oil of salvation: ye bear the people in hand that thereby they shall have health of body and soul: and yet indeed ye have no chrism at all. For pope Innocent saith: *Chrisma conficitur ex oleo et balsamo*: "The chrism is made of oil and balsam." And to the making thereof the balsam is as necessary as the oil. But these many hundred years ye have had no balsam nor

De Consec.
Olei.

[De Offic.
5^{ta} Feriæ.]

[Ritual.
Rom. Sac.
extr. Unct.]

Extra. de
Sacra Unc-
tione.

⁶³ [The substance of the prayers is quoted.]

hath there been any to be had : therefore ye have had no chrism this long while, but have deceived the people with *quid pro quo*, giving them one thing for another.

Now that your oil came not from the apostles, your own doctor Panormitane is witness. For thus he writeth:

Apostoli olim conferebant Spiritum Sanctum sola manus impositione. Et quia hodie prælati non sunt ita beati, fuit institutum ut illi conferrent hoc sacramentum cum chrismate :

Panormitan.
de Consuet.
cap. 5. [leg.
cap. 4. tom.
1. fol. 84. col.
1.]

“The apostles in old time gave the Holy Ghost only by laying on of hands. But nowadays because bishops be not so holy, order hath been taken that they should give this sacrament with chrism.”

Neither is this matter so thoroughly approved by all antiquity as M. Harding imagineth. For pope Innocentius is witness, that in old times there were some that found fault with these doings. These be his words :...*non Judaizat ecclesia cum unctionis celebrat sacramentum, sicut antiqui mentiuntur...* : “The church is not Jewish in solemnizing the sacrament of unction, as the elders have misreported.”

Extra. de
Sacra Unct.
Unctur.

Touching your lights and tapers, Beatus Rhenanus, a man of great learning and judgment, doubteth not but ye borrowed the use thereof from the heathens⁶⁴. I grant, the Christians in old time had lights in their churches, when they met together at their common prayers. But it appeareth by the ancient fathers that the same lights served to solace them against the dark, and not for any use of religion. St. Augustine saith : *Vovent alius oleum, alius ceram ad luminaria noctis* : “They promise” (to the church) “one oil, another wax, for the night lights.”

In Annota-
tion. in 5. lib.
contra Mar-
cionem.

Likewise saith Eusebius : *Καθαρόν φῶς, ὅσον ἐξαρκέσαι πρὸς ἐκλαμψιν τοῖς εὐχομένοις* : *Ignis purus, quantum satis esset ad præbendum lumen precantibus* : “A clear light, so much as might suffice the people at their prayers.” So likewise saith St. Hierom : *Cereos non clara luce accendimus,..... sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solatio temperemus* : “We light not our tapers at midday, but only by this comfort to ease the darkness of the night.” Therefore, M. Harding, unto

Augustin. de
Temp. In
Natali Dom.
serm. 3. [al.
7. v. 213.]

Euseb. de
Vita Const.
Orat. 3.

Hier. adver.
Vigilantium.
[1v. pt. 2.
284.]

⁶⁴ [Beatus Rhenanus : “a Februalibus Romanorum cætibus originem sumpserunt.”]

M. Harding
fol. 7 b.

you that set up lights in your churches, as yourself say, to the honour of God, the ancient father Lactantius saith thus :

Lact. lib. 6.
cap. 2.

Num mentis suæ compos putandus est, qui authori et datori luminis candelarum et cerarum lumen offert pro munere ?

“What, may we think he is well in his wits that unto God, the maker and giver of light, will offer up candles and tapers for a present?” Verily Tertullian saith: *Accendant quotidie lucernas, quibus lux nulla est, &c. Illis competunt et testimonia tenebrarum, et auspicia pœnarum*: “Let them that have no light” (of God) “set up their tapers every day, &c. To them belongeth both the testimony of darkness, and the beginning of pain.”

Tertull. de
Idololatria.
[p. 95.]

But what shall I say of your holy water? No doubt it must needs serve, as your oil doth, to the salvation of body and soul. Augustinus Steuchus, a principal doctor of your side, saith: *Non inane institutum est, quod aquas sale et orationibus sanctificamus, ut ad earum aspersum delicta nostra deleantur [aboleantur]*: “It is no vain invention, that we hallow water with salt and prayers, that by the sprinkling thereof our sins may be forgiven.” Thus profanely and heathen-like he writeth, as if the blood of Christ were quite dried up.

Aug. Steu-
chus in Libr.
Numer. cap.
19.

Beside all this, one of your doctors of Louvain telleth us in good sadness, by report of one of the Jesuits, that in India holy water is very wholesome to drive away mice, and to make barren women to conceive. I feign not this matter: the place may be seen. O, M. Harding, I must needs say of your company, that one said sometime of the Grecians, “These that call themselves catholics are ever children.”

Copus, dial.
1. p. 18 b.

“Ελληνες
ὑμεῖς ἀεὶ
παιδες ἐστέ.

Plato in Ti-
maeo.

Et Theodo-
ret. de Corri-
gendis Græ-
corum Affec-
tibus, lib. 1.
[p. 30. ed.
Gaisford.]

Ye say, ye have changed nothing that is of necessity either to be believed or to be observed. What necessity ye mean, I cannot well conjecture. For, when you list, your holy water and holy bread must needs be of necessity. But indeed of the ancient godly orders of the church ye have in a manner left nothing, unless it be such as ye might best have spared: and the same ye have so defaced with superstition, that it hath now quite lost his former use, and is not the same it was before. Certainly, if you

had changed nothing, then should you have now no private mass.

Therefore we may justly say to you, as Tertullian said in like case unto the Roman heathens: *Ubi religio? Ubi veneratio majoribus debita? Habitu, victu, instructu, sensu,* Tertull. in Apologetico, [cap. 6. p. 7.] *[l. censu,] ipso denique sermone proavis renuntiastis. Laudatis semper antiquitatem [l. antiquos]: nove de die vivitis. Per quod ostenditur, dum a bonis majorum institutis deceditis, ea vos retinere et custodire, quæ non debuistis: cum quæ debuistis, non custoditis:* “Where is your religion? where is the reverence due to your forefathers? You have forsaken them in your apparel, in your diet, in your order, in your meaning, and in your speech. Ye change your life daily: yet ye praise antiquity. Whereby it appeareth, while ye leave the good orders of your elders, that ye keep the things ye should not keep, seeing ye keep not the things ye should keep.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. Divis. 10.

[Vol. iv. p. 8.]

And that this matter should not seem to be done but upon privy slander, and to be tossed to and fro in a corner only to spite us, there have been besides wilily procured by the bishop of Rome certain persons of eloquence enough, and not unlearned neither, which should put their help to this cause now almost despaired of, and should polish and set forth the same, both in books and with long tales, to the end that, when the matter was trimly and eloquently handled, ignorant and unskilful persons might suspect there was some great thing in it. Indeed they perceived that their own cause did every where go to wrack, that their sleights were now espied and less esteemed, and that their helps did daily fail them, and that their matter stood altogether in great need of a cunning spokesman.

M. HARDING.

We cannot despair of this cause, unless we would forsake our faith, as ye have. For believing Christ, which our faith leadeth us unto, we cannot mistrust the continuance of this cause. "Heaven and earth shall pass, but my words shall not pass," saith Truth itself. And his words tell us that he will be with his church all days to the world's end: and that he hath besought his Father to give to it the Spirit of truth, to remain with it for ever. Then be we most assured of this cause. We tell you therefore, it standeth, and shall stand by Christ's presence, and by the Holy Ghost's assistance, to the end. Your cause yet standeth not, but wavereth and tottereth, as that which St. Paul termeth a puff of doctrine, and doubtless shortly fall it shall, as all heresies have fallen.

Confidence of catholics touching their cause. Luke xxi.

Matt. xxviii.

John xiv.

The catholic church assuredly defended.

Ephes. iv.

The authors and professors of them be dead and rotten in hell fire, with weeping and grinding of teeth. The like judgment look ye and your fellows to have, if ye repent not, and revoke your heresies by time.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"We cannot despair," saith M. Harding, "of the continuance of our cause. For heaven and earth shall pass, but Christ's words shall not pass. He will be with us all days to the world's end," &c. These words, M. Harding, be true and certain: and therefore our hope is the firmer. Christ hath promised, that the Spirit of truth shall remain for ever, but not in the pope and his cardinals. For thereof he made no promise. Nay rather the prophet Esay saith, The Spirit of God shall rest upon the poor and meek-hearted, that trembleth at the word of the Lord.

Isa. lxvi. 2.

The church of God shall stand still, yea though Rome were possessed with Antichrist. It is true that Christ saith: "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up." Upon which words St. Hilary saith: *Significat traditionem hominum eruendam esse, cujus favore transgressi sunt præcepta legis*: "He meaneth, that the tradition of man, for which tradition's sake they have broken the law of God, shall be taken up by the roots." Heaven and earth shall pass, and your phantasies and devices, M. Harding, shall pass: the Lord hath spoken

Matt. xv. 13.

Hilar. in cap. 15. Matt. can. 14. in fine. [p. 685.]

it: but the word of God and his church shall endure for ever.

But M. Harding's almanack saith our doctrine shall fall, and that very shortly. Herein I profess I have no skill. God's will be done. It is his cause: whatsoever shall happen, his name be blessed for ever. In like sort the heathens in old times, as St. Augustine saith, vaunted themselves against the faith of Christ: *Ad certum [l. par-*
vum] tempus sunt Christiani: postea peribunt, et redibunt
idola: redibit quod erat antea..... Verum tu, cum expectas,
miser infidelis, ut transeant Christiani, transis ipse sine
Christianis: "These Christians are but for a while: fall they shall, and that shortly. Then shall our idols come again, and it shall be as it was before. But, O thou miserable infidel, while thou lookest that the Christians should pass, thou passest away thyself without the Christians."

Augustin. in
Psalm. lxx.
[Enarr. 2. iv.
736.]

Again he saith: *Ecce veniet tempus ut finiantur, et non sint*
Christiani. Sicut cœperunt ab aliquo tempore, ita usque
ad certum tempus erunt. Sed cum ista dicunt, sine fine
moriuntur, et permanet ecclesia prædicans brachium Domini
omni generationi venturæ: "They say, behold the day will come, when all these Christians shall have an end. As they had a time to begin, so shall they have a time to continue. But while they make these crakes, they themselves die without end. But the church continueth still praising the almighty arm of God to every generation that is to come."

Augustin. in
eundem Psal.
[Enarr. 2.
ibid. 742.]

But ye say, "The authors and professors of our doctrine be damned in hell fire, and cry *Peccavi*." This is a very terrible kind of talk. But it is a rash part for you, M. Harding, so suddenly to skip into God's chair, and there to pronounce your sentence definitive like a judge. But God will judge of your judgment. St. Augustine saith: *Alia est sella terrena, aliud tribunāl cœlorum. Ab inferiori*
sententia accipitur, a superiori corona: "The earthly chair
is one thing, the judgment seat in heaven is another.
From the one we receive sentence, from the other we receive a crown." O, M. Harding, God grant you may once cry *Peccavi*, lest the time come that ye shall cry out, as it

Augustin. in
Psalm. xxxvi.
par. 3. [iv.
290.]

Wisd. v.

is written in the Book of Wisdom : "These are they whom we sometime had in derision, and in a parable of reproach. We fools thought their life madness, and their end without honour. But now are they counted among the children of God, and their portion is among the saints."

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 3. Divis. 2.*

Now, as for those things which by them have ^[Vol. iv. p. 9.] been laid against us, in part they be manifestly false and condemned so by their own judgments which spake them : partly again, though they be as false too indeed, yet bear they a certain show and colour of truth, so as the reader (if he take not good heed) may easily be tripped and brought into error by them, especially when their fine and cunning tale is added thereunto. And part of them be of such sort as we ought not to shun them as crimes or faults, but to acknowledge and confess them as things well done, and upon very good reason. For shortly, to say the truth, these folk falsely accuse and slander all our doings, yea the same things which they themselves cannot deny but to be rightly and orderly done : and for malice do so misconstrue and deprave all our sayings and doings, as though it were impossible that any thing could be rightly spoken or done by us. They should more plainly and sincerely have gone to work, if they would have dealt truly. But now they neither truly, nor sincerely, nor yet christianly, but darkly and craftily charge and batter us with lies, and do abuse the blindness and fondness of the people, together with the ignorance of princes, to cause us to be hated, and the truth to be suppressed.

This, lo ye, is the power of darkness, and of men which lean more to the amazed wondering of the

rude multitude and to darkness, than they do to truth and light: and as St. Hierom saith, do openly gainsay the truth, closing up their eyes, and will not see for the nonce. But we give thanks to the most good and mighty God, that such is our cause, whereagainst (when they would faintest) they were able to utter no despite, but the same which might as well be wrested against the holy fathers, against the prophets, against the apostles, against Peter, against Paul, and against Christ himself.

Hier. advers.
Ruffinum.

M. HARDING.

The catholics do not burden you with ought, wherein by their own judgments they condemn themselves, as ye slander them, not only here, but oftentimes in your book. For if they judged otherwise, they would not wittingly do against their judgment. That is the special property of an heretic, whom St. Paul biddeth all men to avoid, knowing that he that is such is perverted, and seemeth even condemned by his own judgment.

Titus iii. 10,
11.

They shew both your blasphemous heresies and your wicked acts. Luther, ye know, poured out his heresies and villainies, &c. Your robbing of churches, persecuting of men for standing steadfastly in the faith of the holy forefathers, your incestuous marriages of monks, friars, and nuns, your breach of solemn vows for fleshly pleasure, your profaning and abandoning of holy sacraments, your contempt of ancient and godly ordinances and discipline of the church, and such other things of like estimation.

Gen. xvi. 6.
John ii. 15.
Egesippus.

For indeed the catholics do persecute you (if such deserved entreating of evil persons may be called persecution) and all good folk besides, we grant, and shall so do so long as they love the truth, and keep them in the unity of the church: yet with no other mind do they persecute you than Sarai did Hagar, than Christ the Jews, whom he whipped out of the temple, than Peter did Simon Magus.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye wis, M. Harding, it might please you to remember, that Bartholomæus Latomus, a doctor of your side, confesseth in writing to all the world, that our request touching the holy ministration under both kinds, according to Christ's first institution, is just and reasonable:

Bar. Latom.
adversus Bu-
cer. [p. 37.]

That Gerardus Lorichius, another of your own side, saith: *Pseudo-catholici, qui reformationem ecclesie quoquo*

Gerar. Lori-
chius de
Missæ Pro-
ganda, in 7.
par. Canonis.

modo remorari non verentur: "They be false catholics," (and this, M. Harding, he speaketh of you, being one of your own,) "they be false catholics that hinder the reformation of the church by all means they be able." He saith you be false catholics, far contrary to the common opinion: and concludeth in the end that the wilful maintenance and sequel of your doctrine in this point, is, as he calleth it, *hæresis, et blasphemia pestilens et execrabilis*, "an heresy and a blasphemy against God, pestilent and cursed:"

Steph. Gard.
in the Devil's
Sophistry.
[fol. 139.]

That others of your side confess that this your use of ministration under one kind, which now ye call catholic, began first not of Christ or his apostles, or any ancient learned father, but only of the error, or, as he better termeth it, of the simple devotion of the people:

Albert. Pigh.
de Missa
Privata.

That Albertus Pighius⁶⁵, the stoutest gallant of all your camp, granteth there have been and be many abuses in your mass, notwithstanding ye have told us far otherwise:

Platina in
Pio 2.

That pope Pius oftentimes granted, and used commonly to say, he saw great causes why priests should be restored to the liberty of marriage:

Jo. Sleidanus,
lib. 4.

That pope Adrian by his legate Cheregatus confessed openly at Nuremberg in the general diet of all the princes of Germany, that all the ill of the church came first *a culmine pontificio*, "from the top castle of the pope:"

M. Harding,
fol. 22 b.

And to be short, M. Harding, it might have pleased you to remember, that yourself, in your first book in the defence of your private mass, have written thus: "Marry, I deny not, but that it were more commendable, and more godly on the church's part, if many well-disposed and examined would be partakers of the blessed sacrament with the priest."

All these things, M. Harding, be they uses or abuses, reasonable or unreasonable, right or wrong, better or worse: be they never so wicked, never so blasphemous, never so cursed, yet be they stoutly defended still, and no hope offered of amendment: with what conscience of your

⁶⁵ [Albertus Pighius de Privata Missa. This treatise will be found in the "Controversiæ in Comitibus

Ratisponensibus," tract. vi. The references supra, vol. iv. pp. 220 and 286, are to the same passage.]

part, he only seeth that seeth the conscience. You grant ye persecute your brethren where ye have the sword, and may persecute : but as Sarai did Hagar, as Christ did the Jews : and not otherwise. Verily, M. Harding, that Christ or Sarai were persecutors I have not greatly heard, but I remember Chrysostom saith thus : *Nunquid ovīs lupum persequitur aliquando ? Non, sed lupus ovem. Sic enim Cain persecutus est Abel, non Abel Cain. Sic Ismael persecutus est Isaac, non Isaac Ismael..... Sic Judæi Christum, non Christus Judæos. Hæretici Christianos, non Christiani hæreticos. Ergo ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos :* “What, do the sheep persecute the wolf at any time ? No, but the wolf doth persecute the sheep. For so Cain persecuted Abel, not Abel Cain. So Ishmael persecuted Isaac, not Isaac Ishmael. So the Jews persecuted Christ, not Christ the Jews. So the heretics persecute the Christians, not the Christians the heretics. Therefore ye shall know them by their fruits.”

St. Augustine saith : *Non eo modo persecutionem passi sunt pseudo-prophetæ ab Elia, quomodo ipse Elias a rege nequissimo :* “Neither were the false prophets so persecuted by Elias, as Elias was persecuted by the wicked king.” Surely Chrysostom saith : *Quem videris in sanguine persecutionis gaudentem, lupus est :* “Whomsoever ye see rejoicing in the blood of persecution, he is the wolf.”

But ye pretend great good-will, and say ye persecute and murder your brethren for love, as Christ persecuted the Jews. So, I trow, Aristophanes saith, Phidippides took a cudgel and beat his father, and all for love. Howbeit, M. Harding, neither are you armed as Christ was armed, nor was Christ armed as you are armed. I must say to you as St. Augustine saith unto the heretics the Donatists : *Hanc formam ne ab ipsis quidem Judæis persecutoribus accepistis. Illi enim persecuti sunt carnem ambulantis in terra : vos evangelium sedentis in cælo :* “Ye learned not this form of persecution, no not of the Jews. For they persecuted the flesh of Christ walking in the earth : you persecute the gospel of Christ sitting in heaven.” Robert Holcot among other his doubts moveth

Gen. xvi. 6.
John ii. 15.

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
19. [Op. Im-
perf. vi. App.
94.]

Augustin.
contra Liter.
Petilia. lib. 2.
cap. 19. [ix.
230.]

Chrysost. in
Opere Im-
perf. in Matt.
hom. 19. [vi.
app. 94.]

Aristoph.
in Vespis.

Augustin.
contra Liter.
Petilia. lib.
2. cap. 87.
[ix. 272.]

Holcot, in
1 Senten.
quest. 3.
art. 8. dubl. 2.
Origen. in
Gen. hom. 7.
[ll. 78.]

Gen. xxi. 9.

Galat. iv. 29.

John xvi. 2.

Dist. 13.
Item.
In margine.

this question, *An amor sit odium*: "Whether love be hatred or no." If he were now alive, and saw your dealing and the kindness of your love, I believe he would put the matter out of question, and say, undoubtedly your love is hatred, it is no love. So Moses saith: "Ishmael played or sported with Isaac." But St. Paul saith the same playing and sporting was persecution. For thus he writeth: "He that was after the flesh, persecuted him that was after the Spirit."

I doubt not but you think of your part it is well done. For so Christ saith: "Whosoever shall murder you, shall think he offereth a sacrifice unto God." And yourselves have set to this note in great letters in the margin of your decrees: *Judæi mortaliter peccassent, si Christum non crucifixissent*: "The Jews had sinned deadly, if they had not hanged Christ upon the cross." *Benedictus Deus, qui non dedit nos in captionem dentibus eorum*: "Blessed be God that hath not given us to be a prey unto their teeth." To all the rest it is sufficient for M. Harding to say: "They be blasphemous heresies: wicked acts: Luther's heresies and villainies: robbing of churches: breaches of vows: fleshly pleasures: abandoning of the holy sacraments: malices, slanders, and lies." And besides these things in effect he answereth nothing. Now to answer nothing with something, it were worth nothing.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 5.

Now therefore, if it be lawful for the folks to be eloquent and fine-tongued in speaking evil, surely it becometh not us in our cause, being so very good, to be dumb in answering truly. For men to be careless what is spoken by them and their own matter, be it never so falsely or slanderously spoken, (especially when it is such that the majesty of God, and the cause of religion may thereby be damaged,) is the part doubtless of dissolute and wretchless persons, and of them which wickedly wink at the

[Vol. iv. p. 9.]

injuries done unto the name of God. For although other wrongs, yea oftentimes great, may be borne and dissembled of a mild and Christian man, yet he that goeth smoothly away, and dissembleth the matter when he is noted of heresy, Ruffinus was wont to deny that man to be a Christian. We therefore will do the same thing which all laws, which nature's own voice doth command to be done, and which Christ himself did in like case, when he was checked and reviled : to the intent we may put off from us these men's slanderous accusations, and may defend soberly and truly our own cause and innocency.

M. HARDING.

Ye have not proved the truth to be of your side, nor ever shall be able to prove, maintaining the doctrine of the Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists, as ye do. Now all dependeth of that point. And because ye have not the truth, whatsoever ye say, it is soon confuted : and whatsoever ye bring, it is to no purpose.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This is the very issue of the case : whether the doctrine that we profess be the truth or no. Which thing, through God's grace, by this our conference in part may appear. I beseech God, the Author of all truth, and the Father of light, so to open our hearts, that the thing, that is the truth indeed, may appear to us to be the truth.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 4. Divis. 2.*

For Christ verily, when the Pharisees charged him with sorcery, as one that had some familiar spirits, and wrought many things by their help : "I," said he, "have not the devil, but do glorify my Father : but it is you that have dishonoured me, and put me to rebuke and shame." And St. Paul, when Festus the lieutenant scorned him as a mad-

John viii. 49.

Acts xxvi. 25. man : "I," said he, "most dear Festus, am not mad, as thou thinkest, but I speak the words of truth and soberness." And the ancient Christians, when they were slandered to the people for mankillers, for adulterers, for committers of incest, for disturbers of the commonweals, and did perceive that by such slanderous accusations the religion which they professed might be brought in question, namely, if they should seem to hold their peace, and in manner confess the fault : lest this might hinder the free course of the gospel, they made orations, they put up supplications, and made means to emperors and princes, that they might defend themselves and their fellows in open audience.

M. HARDING.

When ye prove that ye have the truth, then may ye be admitted in your defence to allege the example of Christ, of St. Paul, and of the first Christians. But now we tell you, being as you are, these examples serve you to no purpose. And for ought ye have said hitherto, the Anabaptists, Libertines, Zwenkfeldians, Nestorians, Eunomians, Arians, and all other pestiferous heretics, might say the same as well as ye. Christ was charged of the Jews with using the power of impure spirits blasphemously : Paul was scorned of Festus as a madman without cause : the ancient Christians were accused by the infidels of heinous crimes falsely. But ye are accused of heresies and sundry impieties, by godly, wise, and faithful men, upon zeal, by good advice, and truly. And as for those ancient Christians, when they made apologies or orations in the defence of the Christian faith, they did it so as became Christian men, plainly and openly. Either they offered them to the emperors with their own hands, or put to their names, and signified to whom they gave the same. As St. Hilary delivered a book in defence of the catholic faith against the Arians to Constantius : Melito and Apollinaris wrote their apologies to the emperors : St. Justin the philosopher and martyr gave his first apology for the Christians to the senate of the Romans, the second to Antoninus Pius emperor : Tertullian to the Romans : St. Apollonius the Roman senator and martyr did read his book openly in the senate house, which he had made in defence of the Christian faith : but ye do your things, that ought to be done openly, in hucker-mucker. Ye set forth your apology in the name of the church of England, before any mean part of the

Luke xi.
Acts xxvi.
Tertull. in
Apolog.

The Apologies of the old fathers were lawfully published.

Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 26.
Eccl. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 27.

church were privy to it, and so as though either ye were ashamed of it, or afraid to abide by it. The inscription of it is directed neither to pope, nor emperor, nor to any prince, nor to the church, nor to the general council then being when he wrote it, as it was most convenient. There is no man's name set to it. It is printed without privilege of the prince, contrary to the law Untruth. in that behalf made: allowed neither by parliament, nor by proclamation, nor agreed upon by the clergy in public and lawful synod. This packing becometh you: it becometh not the upright professors of the truth. Wherefore your unlawful book, as it is, so it may be called, "an invective," or rather "a famous libel and slanderous writ," as that which seemeth to have been made in a corner, and cast abroad in the streets, the authors whereof the civil law punisheth sharply.

The Apology
a famous
libel.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

How far forth these examples may serve us, we remit the judgment thereof to the discreet Christian reader. It is not enough thus to cry out, Impieties and heresies. M. Harding's bare word in this behalf is not sufficient to warrant an evidence. Certainly among other great comforts that we have in God's mercies this is one, and not the least, that touching the innocency and right of our cause, we may say to you as Christ said to the Pharisees, "We John viii. 49. have not the devil, but we glorify our Father:" or, as St. Paul said unto Festus, "We are not mad," M. Harding, Acts xxvi. 25. "as ye report of us: but we utter unto you the words of truth and sobriety."

But this is a piteous fault. The names of all the bishops, deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars, and curates of England, are not set to our Apology. It is directed neither to the emperor, nor to the pope, nor to the council. Neither is it printed with privilege of the prince. This last clause is a manifest untruth, and may easily be reproved by the printer. Hereof ye conclude, It is a slanderous libel, and was written under a hedge, and, as you say, in hucker-mucker.

First, were it granted that all ye say of Hilary, Melito, Justinus, Tertullian, and Apollonius were true, yet must it needs follow that all books that are not subscribed with the authors' names were written in a corner? First, to begin

with the scriptures, tell us, M. Harding, who wrote the books of Genesis, of Exodus, of Leviticus, of Numery, of Deuteronomium, of Josue, of the Judges, of the Kings, of the Chronicles, of Job, &c. Who wrote these books, I say? who authorized them? who subscribed his name? who set to his seal? The Book of Wisdom, by some, is fathered upon Philo, by some, upon Solomon. The Epistle unto the Hebrews, some say, was written by St. Paul, some, by Clemens, some, by Barnabas, some, by some other: and so are we uncertain of the author's name. St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John, never once named themselves in their gospels. The apostles' Creed, the Canons of the apostles, by what names are they subscribed? how are they authorized? to what pope, to what emperor were they offered? To leave others, the ancient doctors of the church, which, as you know, are often misnamed, Ambrose for Augustine, Greek for Latin, new for old: your doctor of doctors, the fairest flower and crop of your garland, Gratianus, is so well known by his name, that wise men cannot well tell what name to give him. Erasmus saith of him thus: *Quisquis fuit, sive Gratianus, sive Crassianus*: "Whatsoever name we may give him, be it Gratianus or Crassianus." And again he saith: *Eruditi negant illam Gratiani, nescio cujus, congeriem ulla unquam publica ecclesiæ autoritate fuisse comprobata*: "The learned say that Gratian's collection, or heap of matters, was never allowed by any public authority of the church." And again: *Non constat ullis argumentis quis fuerit Gratianus, quo tempore opus suum exhibuerit, cujus pontificis, cujus concilii fuerit autoritate comprobatum*: "It cannot appear by any tokens of record, neither what this Gratian was, nor at what time he offered up his book, nor what council, nor what pope allowed it."

Who subscribed the late council of Cologne? who subscribed the book not long sithence set abroad under the name of the church of Cologne, and named Antididagma⁶⁶?

Erasm. in
Præfat. in
Tertiam Se-
riem quarti
tom. Hiero-
nym.

Erasm. in
Præfatione
in 4. tom.
Hieronymi.

⁶⁶ [Antididagma, Colon. 1544. A copy is in the Bodleian.]

To be short, who subscribed your own late book, entitled, *The Apology of Private Mass*⁶⁷? where were they written? where were they subscribed? by what authority, and under what names were they allowed? I will say nothing of your late famous volume bearing the name of Marcus Antonius Constantius⁶⁸. This book, as you see, hath three great names, notwithstanding the author himself had but two: and yet not one of all these three. What, M. Harding, would you make your brethren believe, that all these be but slanderous writers, devised only in hucker-mucker, and under a hedge?

The decree the apostles made in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, it appeareth not it was so curiously subscribed with all their names. The protestation of the Bohemians in the council of Basil, the confession of the churches of Geneva and Helvetia, for ought that I know, have no such public subscriptions. Neither is it necessary nor commonly used to join private men's names to public matters, neither, in so mighty and ample a realm, upon all incident occasions is it so easy to be done. Briefly, our *Apology* is confirmed by as many names as the high court of parliament of England is confirmed.

Neither was the same conceived in so dark a corner as M. Harding imagineth. For it was afterward imprinted in Latin at Paris: and hath been sithence translated into the French, the Italian, the Dutch, and the Spanish tongues: and hath been sent and borne abroad into France, Flanders, Germany, Spain, Pole, Hungary, Denmark, Sueveland, Scotland, Italy, Naples, and Rome itself, to the judgment and trial of the whole church of God. Yea it was read, and sharply considered in your late convent at Trident, and great threats made there that it should be

⁶⁷ [An *Apologie of Private Mass*, Nov. 1562: a short anonymous work attributed to Harding, probably a prelude to his longer *Answer*. The general tone of the argument resembles his. An answer was published entitled, "*The Defence of the Truth*," by

some attributed to Jewel. Both will be found in the Bodleian under the article "*Missa*," but so much wormeaten as to be illegible in parts.]

⁶⁸ [This was the polemical name assumed by Steph. Gardiner.]

answered, and the matter by two notable learned bishops taken in hand, the one a Spaniard, the other an Italian: which two notwithstanding, these five whole years have yet done nothing, nor, I believe, intend anything to do. Indeed certain of your brethren have been often gnawing at it: but such as care nothing, nor is cared, what they write.

But if names be so necessary, we have the names of the whole clergy of England to confirm the faith of our doctrine, and your name, M. Harding, as you can well remember, amongst the rest: unless as ye have already denied your faith, so ye will now also deny your name. To conclude, it is greater modesty to publish our own book without name, than, as you do, to publish other men's books in your own names. For indeed, M. Harding, the books ye send so thick over are not yours. Ye are but translators: ye are no authors. If every bird should fetch again his own feathers, alas, your poor chickens would die for cold! But, you say, we offered not our book to the pope. No, neither ought we so to do. He is not our bishop. He is not our judge. We may say unto him as the emperor Constantius said sometime to pope Liberius: *Quota es tu pars orbis terrarum?* "What great portion art thou of the whole world?" As for your council of Trident, God wot, it was a silly convent, for ought that may appear by their conclusions.

We offered the defence and profession of our doctrine unto the whole church of God: and so unto the pope, and to the council too, if they be any part or member of the church: and by God's mercy shall ever be able in all places, both with our hands and with our bodies, to yield an account of the hope we have in Christ Jesus. Whereas it liketh you to term our Apology a slanderous libel, I doubt not but whosoever shall indifferently consider your book, shall think M. Harding's tongue wanteth no slander.

Theodoret.
in Hist. Eccl.
[lib. 2. cap.
16. iii. 94.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis. 3.*[Vol. iv. p.
10.]

But we truly, seeing that so many thousands of our brethren in these last twenty years have borne witness unto the truth, in the midst of most painful torments that could be devised : and when princes, desirous to restrain the gospel, sought many ways, but prevailed nothing, and that now almost the whole world doth begin to open their eyes to behold the light : we take it, that our cause hath already been sufficiently declared and defended, and think it not needful to make many words, seeing the matter saith enough for itself.

M. HARDING.

The reasons and examples ye bring for it conclude nothing : because, lacking truth, ye build upon a false ground, whatsoever ye set up, eftsoons it falleth, being stayed by no just proof. Here ye go forth, and fain would ye prop up that matter : but your reasons be as weak as before. There have not so many thousands of your brethren been burnt for heresy in these last twenty years as ye pretend. But when ye come to boasting, then have ye a great grace in using the figure hyperbole. Then scores be hundreds, hundreds be thousands, thousands be millions.

But what was Michael Servetus the Arian, who was burnt at Geneva by procurement of Calvin a brother of yours ? David George, that took upon him to be Christ, who was taken up after he was buried, and burnt at Basil : was he your brother ? To come near home, Joan of Kent, that filth, who took forth a lesson further than you taught her, I trow, or yet preach, was she a sister of yours ? So many Adamites, so many Zwenkfeldians, so many hundreds of Anabaptists and Libertines, as have within your twenty years been rid out of their lives by fire, sword, and water, in sundry parts of Christendom, were they all of your blessed brotherhead ?

And this is the chief argument ye make in all that huge dung-hill of your stinking martyrs, which ye have entituled, Acts and Monuments. But we tell you, it is not death that justifieth the cause of dying ; but it is the cause of dying that justifieth the death.

Princes, ye say, were desirous to restrain your gospel, and though they went about it by many ways, yet prevailed they nothing. Therefore your doctrine must needs be the true gospel.

Servetus
burnt for
heresy at
Geneva.
David
George.
Joan of Kent.

Acts and
Monuments.

As good an argument as this is may thieves make in their defence. For princes be desirous to keep their dominions from robbing, and have ever devised straight laws and punishments for restraint of thieves : yet be thieves everywhere, and theft is daily committed.

A weak argument of truth.

And whereas your gospel is a gross gospel, a carnal gospel, a belly gospel, wonder it is not, if those people be not wholly withdrawn from assenting to the same, who be not of the finest wits, and be much given to the service of the belly, and of the things beneath the belly. Yet where the princes have used most diligence, and best means to stop the course of your heresies, there the people remain most catholic : as every man may judge by view of Italy, Spain, Base Almain, and France, before that weighty sceptre, by God's secret providence for punishment of sin, was committed to feeble hands, that for tender age were not able to bear it.

This carnal gospel soon taketh place amongst carnal hearers.

Your other argument, whereby ye would persuade your gospel to be the truth, is, that now, as ye crake, almost the whole world doth begin to open their eyes to behold the light. This argument serveth marvellous well for Antichrist. And truly, if he be not already come, ye may very well seem to be his forerunners. Nay, sirs, if it be true that ye say, that almost the whole world looketh that way, knowing that in the latter days, and toward the end of the world, iniquity shall abound, and the charity of the more part shall wax cold : we may rather make a contrary argument, and judge your gospel to be erroneous and false, because the multitude is so ready to receive it. Again, Christ hath not loved his church so little, as that the world should now begin to open their eyes to behold the light. For the same cause presupposeth a former general darkness. It standeth not with Christ's promises made to the church, touching his being with the church all days to the world's end, and the Holy Ghost's remaining with it the Spirit of truth for ever, that he should suffer his church to continue in darkness and lack of truth these thousand years past, and now at the latter days to reveal the truth of his gospel by apostates, vow-breakers, church-robbers, and such other most unlike to the apostles.

The argument of the defenders serving well for Antichrist.

Matt. xxiv.

The argument of multitude returned upon the defenders to a contrary conclusion.

Matt. xxviii.
John xiv.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Whatsoever we say, here appeareth small weight in M. Harding's sayings. We make no boast of the numbers and multitudes of our martyrs. And yet, as St. Paul saith, if we should needs boast, we should chiefly boast of such our infirmities. But we rejoyce with them, and give God thanks in their behalf, for that it hath pleased him to prepare their hearts unto temptation, to try and purify them

as gold in the furnace, and to keep them faithful unto the end.

As for David George and Servete the Arian, and such other the like, they were yours, M. Harding, they were not of us. You brought them up, the one in Spain, the other in Flanders. We detected their heresies, and not you. We arraigned them. We condemned them. We put them to the execution of the laws. It seemeth very much to call them our brothers, because we burnt them. It is known to children, it is not the death, but the cause of the death, that maketh a martyr. St. Augustine saith :

Tres erant in cruce : Unus Salvator : alter salvandus : tertius damnandus. Omnium par pœna, sed dispar causa : Augustin. in Psal. xxxiv. par. 2. [lv. 238.]

“There were three hanging on the cross : The first was the Saviour : the second to be saved : the third to be damned. The pain of all three was one, but the cause was diverse.”

Your Anabaptists and Zwenkfeldians we know not. They find harbour amongst you in Austria, Slesia [Silesia], Moravia, and in such other countries and cities where the gospel of Christ is suppressed : but they have no acquaintance with us, neither in England, nor in Germany, nor in France, nor in Scotland, nor in Denmark, nor in Sweden, nor in any place else, where the gospel of Christ is clearly preached. But it hath been your great policy these many late years, when ye murdered the saints of God, first to root out their tongues, for fear of speaking, and then afterward to tell the people they were Anabaptists, or Arians, or what ye listed. With such policy Nero, sometime that bloody tyrant, burnt the Christians in heaps together, and made open proclamations, that they were traitors, and rebels, and had fired the city of Rome.

Sueton. Tranquillus in Nerone.

It pleaseth you, for lack of other evasion, to call the story of martyrs a dunghill of lies. But these lies shall remain in record for ever, to testify and to condemn your bloody doings. Ye have imprisoned your brethren, ye have stripped them naked, ye have scourged them with rods, ye have burnt their hands and arms with flaming torches, ye have famished them, ye have drowned them,

ye have summoned them, being dead, to appear before you out of their graves, ye have ripped up their buried carcases, ye have burnt them, ye have thrown them out into the dunghill: ye took a poor babe falling from his mother's womb, and in most cruel and barbarous manner threw him into the fire.

All these things, M. Harding, are true: they are no lies. The eyes and consciences of many thousands can witness your doings. The blood of innocent Abel crieth to God from the earth: and undoubtedly he will require it at your hands. Chrysostom saith, as it is alleged before: *Quem videris in sanguine persecutionis gaudentem, is lupus est*: "Whosoever hath pleasure in the blood of persecution, the same is a wolf." Ye slew your brethren so cruelly, not for murder or robbery, or any other grievous crime they had committed, but only for that they trusted in the living God. Howbeit, we may say with the old father Tertullian: *Crudelitas vestra nostra gloria est*: "Your cruelty is our glory."

Whereas we vouch the power and authority of God's holy word, for that the more it is trodden down the more it groweth, and for that the kings and princes of this world with all their puissance and policy were never able to root it out, your answer is, that this reason may serve thieves as well as us. To dissemble your odious comparisons, how lightly soever it shall please you to weigh this reason, yet your forefathers the Pharisees in old time seemed to make some account of it. For thus they murmured and misliked among themselves: *Videtis nos nihil proficere. Ecce mundus totus post eum abiit*: "Ye see we can do no good. Lo the whole world" (for all that we can do) "is gone after him." Tertullian likewise saith: *Exquisitor quæque crudelitas vestra illecebra magis est sectæ. Plures effimur quoties metimur a vobis. Semen est sanguis Christianorum*: "The greatest cruelty that ye can devise is an enticement to our sect. How many of us soever ye murder, when ye come to the view, ye find us more and more. The seed of this increase is Christian blood." So St. Augustine: *Ligabantur, includebantur, cædebantur, torque-*

Chrysost. in
Matt. [Op.
Imp.] hom.
19. [vi. app.
94.]

Tertull. ad
Scapulam.
[c. 5. p. 71.]

John xii. 19.

Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[sub finem.
p. 40.]

Augustin. de
Civit. lib. 22.
cap. 6. [vii.
661.]

bantur, urebantur :.....et multiplicabantur : “They were fettered, they were imprisoned, they were beaten, they were racked, they were burnt : and yet they multiplied.”

St. Cyprian saith : *Sacerdos Dei evangelium tenens, et Christi præcepta custodiens, occidi potest, vinci non potest* : Cyprian. lib. 1. ep. 3. [P. 88.]

“The priest of God holding the Testament in his hand, killed he may be, but overcome he cannot be.” So likewise Nazianzen : *Morte vivit : vulnere nascitur : depastum augetur* : “By death it liveth : by wounding it springeth : by diminishing it increaseth⁷⁹.”

Gregorius Nazianzen. in Reditum suum ex agro. [l. 478.]

Thus these holy fathers, when they saw the gospel of Christ increased and grew by persecution, contrary to all judgment of reason and worldly policy, they were enforced, contrary to M. Harding’s judgment, therein to acknowledge the mighty power and hand of God, and an undoubted testimony of the truth. Justinus, a godly learned father and martyr, saith thus of himself : *Cum audirem Christianos publice traduci et exagitari ab omnibus, viderem autem eos ad mortem, et ad omnia quæ ad terrorem excogitari possent, esse intrepididos, cogitabam nullo modo posse fieri ut illi in aliquo scelere viverent* : “When I” (being an heathen, and one of Plato’s scholars) “heard that the Christians were accused and reviled of all men, and yet saw them go to their death, and to all manner terrible and cruel torments, quietly and without fear, I thought with myself, it was not possible that such men should live in any wickedness.” The like writeth Sozomenus of the Christians in the primitive church : *Nec adulatione victi, nec minis perterriti, magnum omnibus argumentum dabant, sese de maximis præmiis in certamen descendere* : “The Christians neither relenting by fair means, nor shrinking for threats, made it well appear to every man, that it was for some great reward they suffered such trouble⁸⁰.”

Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 8. [l. 152.]

Sozomenus, lib. 1. cap. 1. [ll. 9.]

These learned fathers therefore saw that M. Harding could not see, the increasing of the gospel through death and persecution, maugre the might of worldly princes, is an evident token of the truth. The prophet David saith :

⁷⁹ Θανάτῳ ζῇ, καὶ τομῇ φύεται, ὑπὲρ μεγίστων ἁθλῶν τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ αὐξέται δαπανώμενον.

⁸⁰ Δῆλον πᾶσιν, ἐποίησαν, ὥς

ὑπομένουσι.

Psal. ii. 2. 4. "The princes came and consulted together against God, and against his Christ.....But he that dwelleth in heaven will
Prov. xxi. 30. laugh them to scorn." "There is no wisdom, there is no policy, there is no counsel against the Lord."

Further you say: "Our gospel is gross, and the people dull and sensual, and given to their belly and beastly pleasure, and therefore the apter and readier to receive the same." O, M. Harding, what a desperate cause is this, that cannot stand without such manifest blasphemy of the gospel of Christ, and despiteful reproach of God's people! Certainly St. Paul saith: "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation." And the prophet David saith: "The people is Christ's inheritance." What hath the people so much offended you, that you should either in this place so scornfully and so reproachfully report of them, or in your former book so disdainfully call them "swine" and "dogs?" Yet is it not so long sithence yourself was an earnest professor of the same gospel, were it never so gross. Where was then your fineness and sharpness of wit? where was your belly? where was the rest? you should not so soon have forgotten your own self.

Surely, M. Harding, neither will the sensual man, drowned in filthy and beastly pleasures, take up his cross and follow Christ, and yield his neck to your sword, or his body to your fire; neither is it a gross or sensual gospel that will lead him to the same.

You say it standeth not with God's promise to forsake his church a thousand years. It is much for you, M. Harding, openly to break God's commandments, to defile his holy sanctuary, to turn light into darkness, and darkness into light: and yet nevertheless to bind him to his promise.

Psal. ii. 4. All men be liars, but God only is true, and prevaieth
2 Tim. ii. 19. when he is judged. God knoweth his own. Christ will be evermore with his church, yea although the whole church of Rome conspire against him.

M. Harding, fol. 90 b. *Addition.*  Here M. Harding saith: "We succeed *Addition.* the Donatists, and renew their wretched objection against the church," &c. Howbeit we are no Donatists, as his own conscience well knoweth. The Donatists enclosed the church of God within the bounds of one country, and

said there was no church but only their own, which was in Africa. In like sort and with like truth M. Harding so often and so constantly telleth us this day, there is no church nor salvation but under the obedience of the see of Rome. It is easy therefore to see who are the children of those fathers. We say, as all the holy and learned doctors have said, The church of God hath been ever from the beginning, and shall continue unto the end, and overspreadeth all the parts of the world, without limitation of time or place. Notwithstanding sometimes by care and diligence she is kept neat and clean, sometimes by negligence she is laid waste, and overgrown with weeds: and therefore she is compared unto a garden. Sometimes her light is clear and beautiful, sometime she waneth and groweth dark: and therefore she is compared unto the moon.

Solomon's
Song iv. 12.

The church, you say, hangeth not of your well-doing. God's name therefore be blessed. For, if it hung of you, it could not stand. It hangeth only of the assurance of God's promise: and the same promise God extended as well to Hierusalem and Antioch, as he did to the see of Rome. But now Antioch, where Peter had his first apostolic seat, and Hierusalem, where Christ himself first planted his gospel, are both forsaken, and left utterly without faith and knowledge of God. Notwithstanding God is true in all his words, yet unto the wicked he saith: *Non est mihi voluntas in vobis*: "I have no will nor pleasure in you. I will receive no sacrifice at your hands." And St. Paul saith to the church of Rome, even to the same church wherein you so immoderately glory, and assure yourself it cannot err, *Noli altum sapere, sed time*: "Presume not, but stand in awe. For if God have not spared his own people of Israel and Hierusalem, (unto whom he made his promise that his name should dwell there for ever,) how much less will he spare thee? Mark well the mercy and sharpness of God. His sharpness against them that are fallen from him: but his mercy towards thee (O thou church of Rome) if thou continue still in his mercy. Otherwise even thou shalt likewise be hewn down." Thus, M. Harding, St. Paul adviseth the church of Rome to walk

Solomon's
Song vi. 10.
M. Harding,
fol. 89.

Mal. i. 10.

Rom. xi. 20.

in awe, with fear and reverence : and not to presume of herself that she cannot err.

The argument that you form thereof, taken, as you say, out of the scriptures, is very simple. For thus it standeth : Christ hath promised to be with his disciples, and with his faithful for ever unto the end of the world, *ergo*, the church of Rome can never err in matter of faith.

Jerem. vii. 4.

The prophet Jeremy adviseth you better : " Say not," saith he, " The temple of God, The temple of God." We have his temple, we have his word, we have his promise. " Put no confidence in such words. They be words of lying and vanity," saith the prophet, they will deceive you.

Mich. iii. 11.

So saith the prophet Micheas of the priests that deceived the people : *Super Dominum requiescunt, dicentes, Nonne est Jehova in medio nostri? Ideo non veniet super nos malum. Idcirco propter vos Sion ut ager arabitur, et Hierusalem erit in acervum, et mons domus in excelsa sylvæ :* " They rest themselves quietly upon the Lord," that is to say, they embolden themselves upon his promises. " Behold," say they, " is not the Lord in the midst amongst us? Therefore none ill shall happen to us. Even therefore," saith the prophet, " shall the castle of Sion be ploughed up as the corn-field, and Hierusalem shall lie as a heap of stones, and the mount of the temple shall stand waste as a forest." 

But why do you so much abate your reckoning? why make you not up your full account of your fifteen hundred threescore and six years, as ye were wont to do? Ye have here liberally and of yourself quite stricken off five hundred threescore and six years, that is to say, the whole time wherein the apostles of Christ, and holy martyrs, and other learned fathers and doctors lived : in which whole time, it appeareth by your own secret confession, the church of God might well stand both without your private mass (for then was there none) and also without many other your like phantasies. Neither ought you, M. Harding, so deeply to be grieved, and to call us apostates and heretics, for that we have reformed either our churches to the pattern of that church, or ourselves to the example of those fathers.

Verily, in the judgment of the godly, five hundred of those first years are more worth than the whole thousand years that followed afterward.

Addition.

Addition. ☞ “This,” saith M. Harding, “is a manifest blasphemy, and little becometh a Christian man.” But wherefore, I hear small reason. The primitive church, which was under the apostles and martyrs, hath evermore been counted the purest of all others without exception. And therefore the ancient fathers oftentimes appeal to the judgment thereof, as unto the infallible standard and measure of truth. St. Chrysostom speaking hereof, although not specially to this purpose, saith: *Vere tum cælum ecclesia fuit, Spiritu cuncta administrante, cuncta ecclesiæ capita moderante, &c. Nunc vero vestigia tantum rerum illarum tenemus*: “Then verily the church was a heaven, the Spirit of God ordering all things, and directing all the heads of the church. But now we scarcely have the steps and tokens of those things.” And immediately after he saith further: The church now may be likened to a woman that hath lost her old modesty, having only certain tokens and shows of her former felicity, as the chests and foreseals of precious things, being utterly void of the treasure. Thus said St. Chrysostom touching the decay of the church: and yet he thought his words imported no blasphemy. If the form of the church were so much altered in Chrysostom’s days, that is above eleven hundred years past, what may we then think of the times of darkness that have followed sithence? It was no blasphemy therefore, M. Harding, to say, as we say, The first five hundred years of the church are more worth, than the whole thousand that followed afterward. This rather is open blasphemy, to compare the church of Rome, that now is, to a perfect man, as you do, and the primitive church of the apostles and holy martyrs, unto an infant. This surely is blasphemy against God. ☞

M. Harding,
fol. 94 b.

Chrysostom
1 Cor. hom.
36. [x. 339.]

Therefore I will answer you with the words of St. Hierom: *Quisquis es assertor novorum dogmatum, quæso te, ut parcas Romanis auribus: parcas fidei, quæ apostolico ore laudatur. Cur post quadringentos annos docere nos niteris,*

Hierom. ad
Pammachi-
um et Ocea-
num, [iv. pt.
2. 346.]

quod antea nescivimus ? cur profers in medium, quod Petrus et Paulus edere noluerunt ? Usque ad hunc diem sine ista doctrina mundus Christianus fuit : “Thou that art a maintainer of new doctrine, whatsoever thou be, I pray thee spare the Roman ears : spare the faith that is commended by the apostle’s mouth. Why goest thou about now after four hundred years to teach us that faith which before we never knew ? why bringest thou us forth that thing that Peter and Paul never uttered ? Evermore until this day the Christian world hath been without this doctrine.”

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 4. Divis. 7.*

For if the popes would, or else if they could ^[Vol. iv. p. 10.] weigh with their own selves the whole matter, and also the beginnings and proceedings of our religion, how in a manner all their travail hath come to nought, no body driving it forward, and without any worldly help : and how on the other side, our cause, against the will of emperors from the beginning, against the wills of so many kings, in spite of the popes, and almost maugre the head of all men, hath taken increase, and by little and little spread over into all countries, and is come at length into kings’ courts and palaces : these same things me thinketh might be tokens great enough to them, that God himself doth strongly fight in our quarrel, and doth from heaven laugh at their enterprises : and that the force of the truth is such, as neither man’s power, nor yet hell gates are able to root it out.

M. HARDING.

It is well that ye use the term of the beginning and proceedings of your religion. For indeed of late years it began, not at Jerusalem, but at Wittenberg. Neither was it first delivered unto you by an apostle, but by an apostata. Still it proceedeth, and the farther off from the end. And well may ye name it your

proceedings, for there is no stay in it. What liketh to-day, misliketh to-morrow. The silly beguiled souls that follow it be, as St. Paul saith, ever learning, and never reaching to the knowledge of the truth.

2 Tim. iii. 7.

The first beginning of this new gospel, and the occasion that first moved Luther to heresy.

Did not your religion begin first of covetise, and grew it not afterward of rancour and malice, which Martin Luther conceived against the Dominican friars in Saxony, because Albert, the archbishop of Mentz and elector of the empire, had admitted them to be preachers of the pardon of a croisade against the Turks, contrary to an ancient custom, whereby the Augustine friars, of whom Luther was one, had of long time been in possession of that preferment? Is it not well known what a stir friar Luther made against John Tetzel, the friar of St. Dominic's order, for that the said Tetzel was made chief preacher of a pardon, wherein was great gain, and thereby himself was bereft of that sweet morsel, which in hope he had almost swallowed down?

Untruth.

Where you say your religion is spread abroad, and hath taken so much increase against the wills of princes, and almost maugre the head of all men: that is as false as your religion is.

Did not the great slaughter of your hundred thousand Boors of Germany signify to the world your cause to have had the help of man? What may we judge of the great league of German princes made at the diet of Smalcalde, for defence of your Lutheran gospel?

The diet of Smalcalde.

The Huguenots of France.

The troubles and tumults of France raised by your brethren the Huguenots, and the lamentable outrages committed there for your gospel's sake, be they not a witness of fresh memory, that your religion is maintained, set forth, and defended with power and help of men?

That it is now at length come even into kings' courts and palaces, it moveth wise men no less to suspect it, than to praise it.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye make yourself game, M. Harding, for that the preaching of the gospel issued first out of Wittenberg, and not from Rome: notwithstanding Wittenberg is a noble and a famous university, so generally frequented out of all foreign countries, and so much commended for all kinds of tongues and liberal knowledge, as not many the like this day in Christendom.

But be it that Wittenberg were so simple a borough as M. Harding imagineth, yet were it not more simple than was the town of Nazareth: in which poor town, notwithstanding, first appeared the most glorious and greatest light of the world. Christian modesty would not disdain the

truth of God in respect of place. That rather becometh the proud looks of the scribes and Pharisees. They despised Christ and his disciples, and called them Nazarenes in despite of his country. And therefore, it is likely, first grew that scornful question used by Nathanael: *Nunquid ex Nazareth potest aliquid esse boni?* "Can any good thing come from Nazareth," so poor a town? So Celsus the heathen despised the religion of Christ, because it came (not from Rome or Athens, but) from the barbarous Jews.

John i. 46.

Origen. contra Celsum, lib. i. [1. 320.]

For thus Origen reporteth of him: *Dogma Christianum affirmat a barbaris cepisse ortum, hoc est, a Judæis*: "He saith the doctrine of the Christians had his beginning only from a barbarous nation, that is to say, from the Jews."

1 Cor. i. 27.

But this is the mighty hand and power of God. He chooseth the weak things of the world to confound the strong, and the foolish things of the world to confound the

1 Sam. xvii.

49. wise. He overthroweth the great Goliath with a silly sling,

2 Thess. ii. 8.

Matt. xi. 25.

and bloweth down Antichrist in all his glory with the breath of his mouth. "I thank thee, O Father," saith Christ, "for that thou hast hid these things from the wise and politic, and hast revealed the same unto the simple." The faith of

Psalm. xxiv.

1. Christ is not bound to place. The whole "earth is the

Galat. iii. 28.

Lord's, and all the fulness of the same." There is now no distinction of Greek and barbarous. "We are all one in Christ Jesus."

Notwithstanding, the gospel of Christ, that we profess, neither had his beginning from that learned father doctor Luther, nor came first from Wittenberg. It is the same gospel whereof it is written by the prophet: "The law shall come out of Sion, and the word of God out of Hierusalem."

Mich. iv. 2.

Touching your long tale of doctor Luther's avarice and sale of pardons, I mind not, nor need not to answer you. It is a simple stale slander. Yet it often serveth your turn of course, when other things begin to fail. Indeed friar Tetzel the pardoner made his proclamations unto the people openly in the churches in this sort: Although a man had lain with our lady the mother of Christ, and had begotten her with child, yet were he able by the pope's power to

Joh. Sleidanus, lib. 13.

pardon the fault⁸¹. Against this and other like foul blasphemies, doctor Luther first began to speak. Now whether this occasion were sufficient or no, let M. Harding himself be the judge.

We grant, the princes and estates of the world have now laid their power to assist the gospel. God's holy name therefore be blessed. Howbeit, the gospel came not first from them. It sprang up and grew by them many wheres against their wills.

Neither is the gospel therefore the more to be suspected, because it hath entered into princes' courts. Daniel was in king Nebuchadnezzar's palace, and taught him to know the living God. St. Paul rejoiced, and took comfort in his bands, for that there were some even in Nero's court that began to hearken to the gospel. And Eusebius saith : *Valeriani aula erat jam ecclesia Dei* : "Valerian the emperor's court was now become the church of God." Athanasius saith unto the emperor Jovinian : *Conveniens est pio principi*, &c. : "The study and love of godly things is very meet for a godly prince. For so shall you surely have your heart evermore in the hand of God." Likewise saith St. Cyril to the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian⁸² : *Ab ea quæ erga Deum est pietate, reipub. vestræ [l. nostræ] status pendet* : "The state and assurance of your empire hangeth of your religion towards God."

So likewise saith Sozomenus of the emperor Arcadius : *Μόνη ἡ Εὐσέβεια ἀρκεῖ πρὸς σωτηρίαν τοῖς βασιλεύουσιν· ἄνευ δὲ ταύτης μηδὲν ἔστι τὰ στρατεύματα.....*

Therefore it behoveth princes to understand the cases of God's religion, and to receive Christ with his gospel into their courts. For God hath ordained kings, as the prophet David saith, to serve the Lord : and, as Esay saith, to be nurses unto his church.

If there be occasions of vanities or wickedness in princes'

⁸¹ [Sleidan quotes this as asserted by Luther in his answer to duke Henry of Brunswick, anno 1541.]

⁸² [This is a mistake ; the pas-

sage occurs in a letter of the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian to St. Cyril. Lat. ed. 1546. tom. iv. p. 41.]

Philip. 1. 13.

[Euseb. 7. 10. tom. 1. 331.]

Theod. lib. 4. cap. 3. [iii. 148.]

Cyril. in Epist. ad Theodos. et Valentinian. [tom. iv. p. 41. ed. 1546.]

Sozom. lib. 9. cap. 3. [ii. 364.]

Psal. li. 11.

Esa. xlix. 23.

courts, yet is there no court therein comparable to the court of Rome. For there, St. Bernard saith : *Mali proficiunt : boni deficiunt* : "The wicked wax : the godly wane."

Ye strive in vain, M. Harding : this counsel is not of man, it is of God. If princes with their powers could not stay it, much less can you stay it with untruths and fables. The poor beguiled souls, of whom ye speak, are neither so silly, nor so simple, but they are able to espy your follies. The truth of God will stand. Vanity will fall of itself. Remember the counsel of Gamaliel : Fight not against the Spirit of God.

Acts v. 39.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 5. Divis. 3.*

For they be not all mad at this day, so many free cities, so many kings, so many princes, which have fallen away from the seat of Rome, and have rather joined themselves to the gospel of Christ. [Vol. iv. p. 11.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

M. Harding's answer hereto is long : the effect thereof in short is this :

The faith of the holy Roman church is the very catholic faith, which whoso forsake, shall be companions with devils in everlasting fire.

And where ye say, So many free cities, so many kings, I pray you, how many free cities can you name, that have received your sacramentary religion ? Nay, the free cities of Germany, as many as have forsaken the catholic church, do they not persecute you the sacramentaries ? But, say ye, they be fallen from the seat of Rome. So be the Greeks also in a point of two : yet condemn they you for heretics.

Neither be all the free cities in all the country of Germany fallen from the see apostolic. Of five parts of that great country, at least two remain catholic.

Let us see how make ye up the number of so many kings ye speak of ? The realms of England and Scotland, because by God's providence the government of them is devolved to women, forasmuch as they be no kings, though they have the full right of kings, of them I speak not. Now only two christened kings remain, the king of Denmark, and the king of Sweden. Get you now up into your pulpits like bragging cocks on the roost : flap your wings and crow out aloud, So many free cities, so many kings.

But what think you of all the world before this day? were all cities and provinces, all countries, all kings, all princes, &c. till friar Luther came, and with his nun told us a new doctrine, and controlled all the old: were all these mad?

The virtuous men of the society of Jesus, have they not brought many countries, many kings, many princes to the faith of Christ by preaching the doctrine of the catholic church? We will not follow your foolishness in boasting, &c. The faith professed in the holy Roman church is now preached in Peru, in the kingdom of Ignamban, in the kingdom of Monopotapa, in Cambaia, in Japan, in China, in Tartario, in Basnaga, in Taprobana, in Ormuz, in Celon, in Zimor, in Bacian, in Macazar.

The miracles wrought by these holy fathers which converted these countries, I trow ye will not account to be madness. Thus your vain boast in wickedness, wrought by the power of Satan, is put to silence, &c.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“The faith of the Roman church,” saith M. Harding, “is the very catholic faith of Christ, which whoso forsaketh, be he king or emperor, he shall be companion with devils in everlasting fire.” Thus much, I trow, M. Harding learned of the counterfeit decree of Anacletus. For

thus it pleaseth him to gloss and interlace the words of Christ: *Super hanc petram, id est, super ecclesiam Romanam, ædificabo ecclesiam meam*: “Upon this rock, that is to say, upon the church of Rome, I will build my church.”

And therefore pope Bonifacius, for a full resolution of the matter, saith thus: *Subesse Romano pontifici, omni humanæ*

creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pronuntiamus,

omnino esse de necessitate salutis: “We declare, say, determine, and pronounce, that it is of the necessity of salvation for every mortal creature to be subject unto the bishop of Rome⁸³.”

And the Gloss likewise upon the same: *Quicquid salvatur, est sub summo pontifice*: “Whatsoever creature is saved, is under the highest bishop.”

Here is no mention neither of Christ, nor of his gospel. Salvation and damnation hangeth only of the bishop of Rome. This

† Anaclet.
epist. 1.

Extrav.
Comm. de
Major. et
Obedien.
Unam Sanct.

Gloss. eo-
dem cap.

⁸³ [This decree of Boniface (which he borrowed from Thomas Aquinas) is become law, because it was expressly confirmed in Council. Lateran. under Leo X., which

Romanists consider *general*. No modern Romanist therefore can pretend, that it is no longer binding upon the consciences of papists. See Barrow, Supremacy.]

thing once granted, the case is clear: the pope himself hath resolved the doubt. What should we need a better trial? Notwithstanding, Cornelius the bishop of Bitonto in the late chapter at Trident, of the bishop and holy see of Rome, saith thus: *Utinam a religione ad superstitionem, a fide ad infidelitatem, a Christo ad Antichristum, a Deo ad Epicurum,.....velut prorsus unanimes non declinassent, dicentes in corde impio, et ore impudico, Non est Deus:* “O would God” (the pope and all his cardinals⁸⁴) “had not fallen with common consent and altogether from true religion to superstition, from faith to infidelity, from Christ to Antichrist, from God to Epicure, saying with wicked heart and shameless mouth, There is no God.” In like sense of the same bishops and see of Rome St. Bernard saith: *Servi* [leg. *ministri*] *Christi serviunt Antichristo:* “The servants of Christ serve Antichrist.” Cornelius saith: The bishops of Rome are fallen to superstition, to infidelity, to Antichrist, to Epicure: and are not ashamed to say, There is no God. Yet, saith M. Harding, the faith of Rome is the catholic faith: and whoso departeth from the same, be he king or emperor, he shall be companion with the devil in hell-fire. And thus to say is no mere madness.

That the princes and free cities of Germany ever persecuted us, it is utterly untrue, and like the rest of your tales. Notwithstanding some of them have dealt sharply with certain of this side, in consideration either of conscience, as they thought, or of the stay and quietness of their subjects, yet, in open consultation and public diet, they never suffered this doctrine to be condemned. They rejoice in God in our behalf: and being there, they received us under their protection, and offered us such freedom and courtesy, as they seldom have offered the like to any nation.

⁸⁴ [Cornelius seems here to be speaking of Christians in general, but he traces the aberrations of the sheep to the vices and ambition and negligence of the shepherds. His description of the state of the clergy of that day fully bears

out Jewel's statement. “Quibus
“eorum turpitudinum monstribus,
“qua sordium colluvie, qua peste
“non sunt fœdati non corrupti in
“ecclesia Dei et populus et sacer-
“dos?”]

Cornel. E-
pisc. Bitont.
in Concil.
Tridentino.
[Crabbe,
tom. iii. p.
979.]

Psal. xiv. 1.

Bern. in Can-
tic. Canticor.
[serm. 33. iv.
1397.]

Certain of them, by your own confession, have already agreed to all the points of our doctrine. But none of them all, no not one would ever suffer the same doctrine of ours to be condemned in open assembly, and to be judged for heresy.

What the Grecians this day think of us, I cannot tell. Notwithstanding it appeareth by their letters, written purposely to the church of Bohemia⁸⁵, that they allow well of our doctrine, and utterly condemn yours. For thus they write unto them: Οὐκοῦν ποθεινότατοι ἀδελφοὶ καὶ υἱοὶ, εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν, ὥς ἀκούομεν καὶ ἐλπίζομεν, ἐπισπεύσατε τὴν μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔνωσιν: “Wherefore, loving brethren and children, if it be so as we hear and hope, make haste that we may join together in unity.”

And again, thus it is recorded in the late council of Lateran⁸⁶: *Græci in tantum cœperunt abominari Latinos, ut.....si quando sacerdotes Latini super eorum altaria celebrassent, ipsi non vellent prius in illis sacrificare, quam ea, tanquam per hoc inquinata, lavissent*: “The Greeks began so much to abhor the Latins, that, if it had happened the Latin priests had ministered upon their altars, they would not afterward make oblation upon the same, before they had washed them: as thinking their altars defiled by the Latins’ handling.” Wherefore, M. Harding, whatsoever the Grecians think of us, it appeareth hereby they utterly refuse your communion, and condemn you for heretics.

But who would have thought M. Harding had been so skilful in proportions? The whole country of Germany, saith he, being divided in equal portions, two of five remain still in the obedience of the see of Rome. We give God thanks, it is as it is. Indeed certain towns subject to the bishops, in outward usage of their churches, remain still as they were before. Yet nevertheless, in most places where the

⁸⁵ [In the ed. of 1611, the two marginal references were so printed as to convey the erroneous impression that the Epistle would be found in chap. 4. of the Lateran Council (of A.D. 1215). The Epistle was written A.D. 1551. It will be

found in Le Moyne’s *Varia Sacra*, tom. i. p. 298.]

⁸⁶ [The late council of Lateran was that under Julius and Leo X.; whereas the council here quoted is that under Innocent III. A.D. 1215.]

Epist. Ecclesiae Constantinopol. ad Eccles. Praegensem.

Concil. Lateran. cap. 4. [xxii. 989, 990.]

churches are popish, the people of all sorts are protestants, and love the truth, and are much ashamed of your follies. It was God's secret providence that certain of yours should remain amongst us a season, as the Canaanites remained amongst the people of Israel. Otherwise within few years ye would deny that ever your disorders had been so great.

It is very hard, and in manner not possible, to convert the whole people of so great a country all at once. The hairs of a man's beard or head never wax white altogether.

Luke xiii. 21. Christ compareth the kingdom of God unto leaven, which the woman taketh and layeth in a lump of dough. It

Eusebius. worketh and laboureth by little and little, until it have leavened all the whole. In this sort Eusebius seemeth to

compare the two parts of the Roman empire dissenting in judgment of religion: the east part to the night, and the

John xii. 32. west to the day. But Christ will draw all unto himself,

1 Cor. xv. 28. and then shall God be all in all.

But here to match our so many kings, and so many princes, M. Harding hath brought us a many of news out of Ignamban, Monopotapa, Cambaia, Japan, Bisnaga, Ormuz, and other strange and far countries. There, he saith, so many and so many kings and princes are lately converted, and brought to the obedience of the see of Rome. I marvel, he saith not the man in the moon was likewise newly christened to make up the muster.

Howbeit, all these things must needs be true. For Christ's own fellows, or, as M. Harding uttereth it in better wise, the holy fathers of the society of Jesus, have sent home word as well hereof, as also of sundry miracles wrought by the same holy fathers. Verily, so the name of Christ be published, whether it be by them or by us, by light or by darkness, God's holy name be blessed. But of many their miracles I have no skill. For thus these holy fathers write, as it is said before, that with holy water they have driven mice out of the country, and made barren women to bear children, and such other the like marvellous miracles. Neither are we bound of necessity to believe all such

Copus Dialog. 1. p. 18.

Alexander de Hales, par. 4. 4. que. 53. mem. 4. art. 3. solut. 2.

miracles whatsoever without exception. Alexander of Hales saith: *In sacramento apparet caro,.....interdum*

humana procuratione, interdum operatione diabolica : “ In the sacrament itself there appeareth flesh, sometime by the conveyance of men, sometime by the working of the devil.”

Likewise saith Nicholas Lyra: *Aliquando in ecclesia fit maxima deceptio populi in miraculis fictis in sacerdotibus, vel eis adhærentibus propter lucrum* : “ Sometime even in

the church the people is shamefully deceived with feigned miracles wrought either by the priests, or else by their companions, for lucre’s sake.” Miracles be not evermore undoubted proofs of true doctrine. Therefore St. Au-

gustine saith unto Faustus the Manichee: *Miracula non facitis: quæ si feceritis, tamen ipsa in vobis caveremus*: Augustin. contra Faust. lib. 13. [cap. 5. viii. 254.]

“ Ye work no miracles: and yet if ye wrought any, at your hands we would take heed of them.” The prophet Jeremy saith: *Seduxerunt populum meum in mendaciis suis, et in miraculis suis* : “ They have deceived my people by their lies, and by their miracles.”

Touching the conversion of the east India, Vesputius Vesputius. writeth, there were many godly bishops there, and sundry whole countries converted and christened long before that either the Portugales or the Jesuits came thither: and yet had never heard of the name of the bishop of Rome.

As for the rest of the west Spanish Indies, the people there lived not only without all manner knowledge of God, but also wild and naked, without any civil government, offering up men’s bodies in sacrifice, drinking men’s blood, and eating men’s flesh. Some of them worshipped the sun and the moon, some an ancient old tree; some whatsoever they saw first in the morning, they thought the same for that day to be their God. Some worshipped certain familiar devils, and unto them sacrificed young boys and girls.

Petr. Martyr Mediolanen. [de insul. nuper inventis.]

Being in this miserable state, and naturally by the very sense and judgment of common reason abhorring and loathing their own blindness, what marvel is it if they were easy to be led into any religion, specially carrying such a show of apparel, and holy ceremonies?

Addition. ☞ “ Here,” saith M. Harding, “ M. Jewel M. Harding, fol. 96 b. attributeth the glorious conversion of the Indians to the

leading of natural reason. This," saith he, "is his heathenish heart. What could Porphyry, or Julian, or Celsus say more?" And what maketh you, M. Harding, to be so vehement? Is nature so blind that she can no way discern what is likely or unlikely in any part of religion? Wherefore then doth St. Paul say, speaking only of natural men

Rom. i. 19.

and of the light of nature: "That thing that may be known of God is opened unto them. The invisible things of God are known" (naturally) "by the creatures of the world: even the everlasting power of God, and his divinity?" Or

Rom. ii. 14.

why saith he: "The heathens that have not the law of God, yet by nature do the things that pertain to the law: and having no law, they are a law to themselves, and shew forth the work or effect of the law written within" (by nature) "in their hearts?" St. Ambrose addeth further:

Ambros. ad Roman. cap. 2. [app. 41.]

Gentilis, duce natura, credit in Christum: Gentilis per solam naturam intellexit authorem: "The heathen by the leading of nature believeth in Christ: the heathen only by nature hath known God, the maker of the world⁸⁷." In the short

Hierom. ad Roman. cap. 1. [v. 929.]

Commentaries, that bear the name of St. Hierom, it is written thus: *Cognoverunt Deum, sive per naturam, sive per facturam et rationem*: "The heathens knew God, either by nature, or by creation and way of reason." And again:

[Ibid. 928.]

Homo naturaliter potest scire de Deo, et quod sit, et quod justus sit: "Man may by nature know of God, both that he is, and that he is just⁸⁷." If these sayings be so heathenish and Jewish in us, why are they suffered in St. Paul, in St. Hierom, in St. Ambrose, and in other holy fathers?

I say not that nature alone is able to lead us into the perfection of faith, or to endue our hearts with the Spirit of God. But thus I say, Nature of herself is oftentimes able to discern between truth and falsehood. Cicero saith, only of the ability and force of nature: *Utinam tam facile vera invenire possem, quam falsa convincere*. By which confession it appeareth, although he were not able by skill of nature to find the truth, yet was he able by the same to

De Natura Deor. lib. 1. [cap. 32.]

⁸⁷ [The Commentaries on the Epistles, attributed respectively to St. Ambrose and St. Jerome, are not genuine. As respects St. Jerome, Jewel's words imply his being aware of it.]

reprove the falsehood. And therefore, speaking of the vanity of his own heathen religion, he saith: *Quid negotii est hæc poetarum et pictorum portenta convincere?* Tuscul. 1. [cap. 6.] “What mastery is it” (even only by the light of natural wisdom) “to reprove the fabulous wonders of painters and poets?”

The heart of man is naturally inclined to religion: notwithstanding, being blinded with original sin, in the choice thereof it oftentimes falleth into horrible errors. When the Christians in Rome had chosen a void plat in the city, and therein had builded themselves a church for the service of Christ, and the taverners or victuallers there had laid claim to the same plat, for that it seemed to stand commodiously for their utterance, Alexander Severus the emperor, being an heathen and void of faith, and led only by the guiding of nature, having the hearing of the matter, answered the taverners in this sort: “It is better that God be any way worshipped in that place, than you should have it.” The Tartarians of late years, having no certain religion of their own, submitted themselves to the religion of the Turks⁸⁸. Nature taught them it was better to have the Turkish religion than none at all.

Ælius Lampridius in Alexandro.

Vesputius in Novo Orbe, fol. 485. [cap. 5. fol. 491. ed. 1537.]

This therefore is it that I say, M. Harding: The poor Indians, living by man’s flesh, and going naked, having no manner sense nor knowledge of God, but falling down either before an old tree, or before the sun and the moon, or whatsoever thing they saw first in the morning, when they saw the religion of Rome, with so many ceremonies and shows of holiness, very nature taught them to think the same far better than their own. What heathenish infidelity find you herein, or what blasphemy against the power of God? As blind as your Indians are this day, if they might see both your and our religion set open before them, I doubt not but nature herself would lead them to judge that ours is the light, and yours darkness. St. Paul, speaking of the disorder of praying unto God, that he saw

⁸⁸ [Jewel is mistaken in his reference. The author in the “Novus Orbis,” whom he should have quoted, was Mathias a Michov, de Sarmatia, and not Vesputius.]

1 Cor. xi. 14. among the Corinthians, saith thus: *Nonne natura ipsa docet vos*: “Doth not very nature teach you this thing?”

All this notwithstanding, I say not, that nature is able to lead us into all the secresies and mysteries of Christ’s
 Matt. xi. 25. gospel; Christ himself saith: “God oftentimes hideth these things from the” (natural) “wise and great learned men,
 John xiv. 6. and revealeth the same unto babes.” And again: “No man
 John vi. 44. cometh to my Father, but by me.” And: “No man cometh to me, unless he be drawn by my Father.” And unto
 Matt. xvi. 17. Peter he saith: “Flesh and blood hath not revealed these things to thee, but the Spirit of my Father which is in heaven.”

As for the conversion of the wild Indians, which you call so glorious, I pray God it may not justly be said unto you, that Christ said unto the Pharisees: “Ye seek about by sea and by land to find one novice: and when ye have gotten him, ye make him the child of hell, double worse than yourselves.” 

Matt. xxlii.
15.

And what if God would use this mean for the time, afterward the better to lead the said nations to the clear light of the gospel, as St. Augustine saith, the shoemaker useth his bristle not to sew withal, but to draw in his thread? No doubt, M. Harding, if your doctrine and ours were laid together, the very Indians themselves, be they never so rude, would be able to see a great difference.

But let the bishop of Rome win abroad and lose at home. You remember the old proverb, *Dionysius Corinthi*, Dionysius when he had lost his kingdom at home at Syracusa, he got himself to Corinth, and there became a school-master, and so seemed to continue a kingdom still⁸⁹.

We make no boast, M. Harding, nor get us to roost, as ye say, nor flap our wings in the behalf of these princes and countries, so many and so many as it pleaseth you to sport, that have submitted themselves to the gospel of Christ. Neither are the same so many and so many so few as you would seem to make them. The kingdom of

⁸⁹ [“.... sed nosti illud *Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ*.” Cicero. Epist. ad Attic. lib. 9.]

England, the kingdom of Scotland, the kingdom of Denmark, the kingdom of Sweden, the dukes of Saxony, the duke of Brunswick, the palsgrave of Rhine, the duke of Wirtenberg, the landgrave of Hessa, the marquis of Brandeburg, the prince of Russia, all other the earls, and noblemen, and great cities through the whole country of Germany, the mighty commonweals of Helvetia, Rhetia, Vallis Tellina, with so many hundred thousands besides in France, Italy, Spain, Hungary, and in the kingdom of Pole : certainly all these well reckoned cannot seem so few as ye would have it. Ye wiss, M. Harding, it grieveth you full sore they are so many. If God of his mercy bless those things that he hath mercifully begun, it will be high time for you shortly to seek a new refuge.

We boast not ourselves of these things. There is no cause. It is not the work of man : it is the only hand of God. David saith : " Let the heavens rejoice : let the earth be glad : " " The voice " of the apostles " is sounded abroad into all the world. " The angels of God sang, " Glory be to God on high. " The angel in the Apoca-
Psalm xix. 5.
 lypse crieth amain : *Cecidit, cecidit Babylon illa magna* : Rev. xiv. 8.
 " Down, down is fallen that great Babylon. " Tertullian
Luke ii. 14.
 saith : *Parthi, Medi, Elamitæ, &c.* : " The Parthians, the Medians, the Elamites, the people of Mesopotamia, of Ar-
Tertull. contra Judæos. [p. 189.]
 menia, of Phrygia, of Cappadocia, of Pontus, of Asia, of Pamphylia, of Egypt, of Africa, of Rome, of Hierusalem, of Getulia, of Mauritania, of Spain, of France, of Britanny, of Sarmatia, of Dacia, of Germany, of Scythia, and many other nations and provinces, known and unknown, have received the gospel of Christ. " Thus said they, the angels and prophets of God, and holy fathers, and yet without boasting, or flying to roost, or clapping of wings. Give us leave therefore, M. Harding, in the like case to solace ourselves with the consideration of God's mighty and merciful works, and humbly to rejoice at the triumph of the cross of Christ.

Arnobius saith unto the heathens : *Ne nobis de nostra frequentia blandiamur. Multi nobis videmur : sed Deo admodum pauci sumus. Nos gentes nationesque distinguimus,*
Arnob. contra Gentes, lib. 8.

Deo una domus est mundus hic totus : " Let us not flatter ourselves of our great multitudes. Unto ourselves we seem many : but unto God we are but few. We put difference between nation and nation, but unto God this whole world is but one house⁹⁰." This counsel, M. Harding, is wholesome for either part to follow, that whoso will rejoice may rejoice in the Lord.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 5. Divis. 4.*

And although the popes had never hitherunto ^[Vol. iv. p. 11.] leisure to consider diligently and earnestly of these matters, or though some other cares do now let them, and divers ways pull them, or though they count these to be but common and trifling studies, and nothing to appertain to the pope's worthiness, this maketh not why our matter ought to seem the worse. Or if they perchance will not see that which they see indeed, but rather will withstand the known truth, ought we therefore by and by to be counted heretics, because we obey not their will and pleasure ?

M. HARDING.

Sith Christ hath given to the pope in Peter, whose lawful successor he is, commission to feed his sheep : wholesome feeding ^{John xxi.} being the end of that commission, it is not to be doubted but he that ordained the end, hath also ordained means belonging to the end. Therefore it is not the duty of a good and humble sheep to give forth a malicious surmise, that the shepherd will not see that he seeth indeed, but rather will withstand the known truth. And whatsoever sheep be disobedient, and refuse to hear the voice of their shepherd, whom Christ hath made over them, the same be not of Christ's fold. And maintaining contrary doctrine to their shepherd's true doctrine, justly may they be accounted heretics.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

To be Peter's lawful successor, it is not sufficient to leap into Peter's stall. Lawful succession standeth not only in

⁹⁰ [There is a mistake in the reference to Arnobius, as there are only 7 books adv. Gentes.]

possession of place, but also, and much rather, in doctrine and diligence. Yet the bishops of Rome, as if there were nothing else required, evermore put us in mind, and tell us many gay tales of their succession. Pope Symmachus saith: *In papa si desint bona acquisita per meritum, sufficientiunt quæ a loci prædecessore præstantur*: “If the pope want virtues and goodness of his own, yet the virtues that are given him by (Peter) his predecessor are sufficient.” And the Gloss upon the same: *Petrus fecit papam hæredem bonitatis suæ*: “Peter hath made the pope heir of his goodness⁹¹.”

Distin. 40.
Non nos.

Glossa ibid.
in verb. Cum
hæreditate.

But St. Hierom saith far otherwise: *Non sanctorum filii sunt, qui tenent loca sanctorum*: “They be not evermore holy men’s children, that sit in the rooms of holy men.” Likewise saith Alphonsus de Castro, a special assistant of that side: *Quamvis teneamur ex fide, credere verum Petri successorem esse supremum totius ecclesiæ pastorem, tamen non tenemur eadem fide credere Leonem aut Clementem esse* ^{Alphonsus contra Hæres. lib. i. cap. 9. [p. 55.]} *verum Petri successorem*: “Notwithstanding we be bound by faith to believe, that the true successor of Peter is the highest shepherd of the whole church, yet are we not bound by the same faith to believe that Leo or Clement” (being bishops of Rome) “are the true successors of Peter.”

Distin. 40.
Non est facile.

The words that Christ spake unto Peter import no sovereignty, but were common to all the rest. St. Cyprian saith: *Hoc erant utique cæteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis.....*: “The rest of the apostles were even the same that Peter was, all endued with like fellowship both of honour and of power.” What special privilege then can the pope claim by the succession of St. Peter? or what talketh he of feeding the whole flock of Christ, that never feedeth any part thereof? Wherein is the pope like St. Peter? or wherein ever was St. Peter like the pope?

John xxi.
15—17.

Cyprian. de
Simplicit.
Prælat. [p.
195.]

Yet M. Harding doubteth not to give his definite sentence, “Whatsoever sheep is not obedient to the head shepherd, is not of the flock of Christ.” The pope also

⁹¹ [Distin. 40. Non nos: in are, “.... ad hoc transmisit, ut Glossa. The words of the Gloss “essent hæredes bonitatis suæ.”]

Distin. 81.
Si qui sunt,
In Glossa.

himself boldly warranteth the same. Thus he saith of himself: *Quicumque præceptis nostris non obedierit, peccatum idololatriæ et paganitatis incurrit*: "Whosoever obeyeth not our commandments, falleth into the sin of idolatry and infidelity." And therefore pope Stephen thus advanceth the authority of his own see: *Sacrosancta Domina nostra Romana ecclesia*: "Our holy lady the church of Rome."

Distin. 79.
Oportebat.

John x. 14.

Luke vi. 47.

Galat. ii. 11.
14.

De Conces.
præbendæ.
Proposuit.
Hostien. [su-
per text. De-
cret.]

De Rescrip-
tis. Si quan-
do, ver. Sed
nunquid.

But Christ speaking of himself, saith: "I am the true Shepherd:" and, "Whoso heareth these words of mine, and doeth the same, I will liken him to a wise man." St. Paul, being but one of the sheep, saith thus: "I withstood Peter" (as M. Harding saith, the head shepherd) "even unto his face, for that he walked not uprightly to the gospel of Christ." Yet was he a sheep of the flock of Christ. Hostiensis in this case seemeth reasonable: his words be these: *Omnes debent obedire papæ, quicquid præcipiat, nisi sequi possit peccatum*: "All men must obey the pope, whatsoever he command, so there follow no sin of his commandment⁹²." Likewise Felinus a notable canonist: *Non obstante plenitudine potestatis quæ est in papa, non est obediendum ei, peccato imminente*: "Notwithstanding the fulness of power that is in the pope, when sin shall follow his bidding, we may not obey him."

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
46. [iii. pt. 2.
604.]

If the pope will claim the head pastorship over the whole flock of Christ, or rather, if he will be taken for any pastor at all, let him then feed the flock: let him break the bread of life without leaven: let him speak the word of God truly, without fables, and we will hear him. Otherwise St. Augustine hath warned us: *Sua si docere velint, nolite audire, nolite facere. Certe enim tales sua quæerunt, non quæ sunt Jesu Christi*: "If they will teach you doctrines of their own, see ye hear them not," (and whatsoever such thing they command you,) "see ye do it not. For undoubtedly such men seek for their own matters, and not the things that pertain to Jesus Christ."

⁹² [The substance of Hostiensis is given by Jewel after Felinus.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. *Divis.* 6.

[Vol. iv. p. 11.]

If so be that pope Pius were the man, (we say not, which he would so gladly be called,) but if he were indeed a man that either would account us for his brethren, or at least would take us to be men, he would first diligently have examined our reasons, and would have seen what might be said with us, what against us : and would not in his bull, whereby he lately pretended a council, so rashly have condemned so great a part of the world, so many learned and godly men, so many commonwealths, so many kings, and so many princes, only upon his own blind prejudices and foredeterminations, and that without hearing of them speak, or without shewing cause why.

M. HARDING.

Speak of pope Pius what ye will, and what ye can, neither your praise can advance his estimation, nor your dispraise abase it. His singular virtues be well known. God is highly to be praised for that he hath provided for his flock so good a shepherd. As for you, as he taketh you to be men, so not his brethren, because ye have cut off yourselves from the catholic church. Your reasons have been diligently and exactly examined already. In respect of your reasons, learning, and holy scriptures which ye bring, ye are found such as Balsasar king of Babylon was signified by the hand that appeared writing before him in the wall.

A comparison between the defender and Balsasar king of Babylon.

What it is, heretics to be admitted to reasoning, it is and hath been evermore too well known. Be they never so thoroughly confuted, they yield not. Overcome they may be, reformed they will not be. Therein no good lightly is done.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

If pope Pius were so good a man, and so fit and worthy a pastor for the church of God, why then did his cardinals of late labour so earnestly by treason and conspiracy to depose him, being, as you say, so good a man? or, if it were not so, why then did he himself complain thereof so bitterly in an oration pronounced openly in Rome in the

Oratio Pii
Papæ. [ap.
Goldastum
1274.]

consistory? Is it not lawful for so good a man to live in Rome? is the same proclamation now practised among the cardinals in Rome, that was sometime used in the council-house at Ephesus, *Nemo nostrum frugi esto*: “Let no good man be amongst us⁹³?” This oration is abroad in print. If you doubt the authority thereof, we wrote it not: it is none of ours.

Ye say, pope Pius would not vouchsafe to call us his brethren. No marvel, seeing his own dear and first begotten children, the cardinals, would no longer have him to be their father. It is sufficient for us, that Christ the Son of God is content to call us his brethren.

Ye have excommunicate us, as the Pharisees did the apostles, because we speak unto you in the name of Christ.

But your own law saith: *Excommunicatus non potest excommunicare*: “He that is excommunicate himself, cannot give sentence to excommunicate others.” And your own

Gelasius saith: *Neminem ligare debet* [leg. *potest gravare*] *iniqua sententia*: “A wicked sentence” of excommunication “bindeth no man.” But before all others God himself

saith: *Ego benedicam maledictionibus vestris*: “I will bless that you curse,” saith the Lord. You say you have weighed our reasons, and have found them too light. Now surely that is a good light answer. Even in such light sort Julianus the Apostata wrote sometime unto the Christian bishops: *Ἀνέγνων, ἔγνων, κατέγνων*: “I have read your reasons: I know them well enough: and therefore I have condemned them.” But the same Christian bishops answered him again: *Ἀνέγνως, ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἔγνως· εἰ γὰρ ἔγνως, οὐκ ἂν κατέγνως*: “It may be ye have read our reasons, but ye understand them not: for if ye understood them, ye would not condemn them.” St. Paul also likewise saith: *Nam si cognovissent, nunquam Dominum gloriæ crucifixissent*: “If they had known, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory.”

But unto many of your side, M. Harding, I fear me we may over truly say, as St. Hilary saith unto the Arian

⁹³ [This is reported by Diogenes Laertius in vita Heracliti lib. ix. sub init.]

ἡμέων οὐδ-
εις ὀνήϊστος
ἔστω.
[Diogenes
Laert. Vita
Heracliti.]

Matt. xxviii.
10.
John xx. 17.

John ix. 12.
16.

24. Quæst. 1.
Audivimus.

11. Quæst. 3.
Cui est illata.

Mal. ii. 2.
Psalm. cxix.
28.

Sozomen.
lib. 5. cap.
18. [ii. 208.]

1 Cor. ii. 8.

heretics: *Vere Deum nesciunt: atque utinam nescirent: cum procliviori enim venia ignorarent*: “Indeed they know not God: and would God they knew him not: then their ignorance were the easier to be pardoned.”

Hilar. de Synodis adversus Arianos. [p. 1186.]

You say, there is no disputation to be had with heretics. Yet your fathers in the council of Basil, and your friends in the last council of Trident, I will not say, had disputations, but certainly yielded, and gave place unto the Bohemians, and unto such others as you call heretics.

In Appendice Concil. Basil. Hæc Sanct. [xxix. 413 b.] Concil. Trident. sess. 6.

Addition.

Addition. ☞ “This lie,” saith M. Harding, “is so clear and evident, that our confutation is needless. Neither is it told wherein these councils should yield, nor where that yielding should be found.” *The answer.* So clear, saith M. Harding, is this lie. Howbeit, if he had better considered his books, he might have found that this so clear a lie is an evident truth. First, the council of Basil, contrary to the order of the Roman church, yielded unto the Bohemians the holy communion in both kinds: and yet the same Bohemians they called heretics. The words there among others are these: *Indultum liberationis communionis sub utraque specie*. The like might you have found in cardinal Cusanus, if ye had well sought it. Thus he writeth unto the priests of Bohemia: *Neque ita est ut scribitis, nos compactiones ignorare. Nam illæ aliquam correctionem, nobis tunc præsidentibus in natione Germanica, receperunt: maxime in capite de libertate communionis: ubi apponi fecimus, facultatem in eventum dari sacerdotibus, posse communicare populum modo qui ibi ponitur*: “Neither is it so as you write, that we know not the agreement or composition. For the same composition was corrected when I was president in Germany, specially in that article that toucheth the liberty of the communion: whereunto I caused to be added, that upon a further proof the priests should have liberty to communicate the people in that sort that there is mentioned.” Here have you that thing which you say is not possible to be found. And you have it confirmed and avouched by a cardinal of the church of Rome. Touching the same Article, the late council of Trident hath likewise yielded, howbeit, with many long

M. Harding 98 a.

Concil. tom. 3. in Appendice, Concil. Basil. p. 243. Hæc Sanctus. [xxix. 413 b.] Nicol. Cusanus ad Bohemos, epist. 6. [p. 856.] De libertate Communionis. Posse Communicare populum.

Concil. Trident. sess. 6. ap. Kemnitium, p. 150. ed. Francof. ann. Dom. 1578. [il. 136. ed. 1596.] nam in ipso concilio frustra quaeras.

and solemn protestations⁹⁴. The words begin thus: *Ut sub utraque specie communicare volentes*, &c.: "We ordain that whatsoever church or nation will receive the communion under both kinds, first they agree both in heart and word with all the ordinances of the church of Rome. Secondly, that they shall be subject and obedient unto the pope, as reverent children unto their father," &c.

Thus, M. Harding, have your councils yielded even unto them, that they themselves have condemned for heretics. Now have I told you both wherein these two councils have yielded, and also where this yielding may be found. Therefore I rede you henceforth, not to be so ready in dealing of lies. ➡

But ye have reason: ye can foresee your best advantage. It were the readiest way to disclose your shame. You never yet came to disputation, but some of your company shrank away from you. As I before⁹⁵ have reported out of Tertullian: *Veritas nihil veretur, nisi abscondi*: "Truth feareth nothing, but lest she be hid." If the God of Israel come into the temple, the idol of Dagon must needs fall down.

Tertull. in Apologetico. [sub init.]

1 Sam. v. 3.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 1.

But because he hath already so noted us openly, ^[Vol. iv. p. 11.] lest by holding our peace we should seem to grant a fault, and specially because we can by no means have audience in the public assembly of the general council, wherein he would no creature should have power to give his voice, or to declare his opinion, except he were sworn and straitly bound to maintain his authority: for we have had good experience hereof in the last conference at the council of Trident: where the ambassadors and divines of the princes of Germany, and of the free cities, were

⁹⁴ [The reference to Chemnitii Examin. Concil. Trident. was first inserted in the ed. of 1609.]

⁹⁵ [See supra, vol. iv. p. 158.

Jewel is evidently quoting from memory; the real words being, "unum hoc gestit ne ignorata damnatur."]

quite shut out from their company. Neither can we yet forget, how Julius the Third, above ten years past, provided warily by his writ, that none of our sort should be suffered to speak in the council, except that there were some man peradventure, that would recant and change his opinion. For this cause chiefly we thought it good, to yield up an account of our faith in writing, and truly and openly to make answer to those things, wherewith we have been openly charged : to the end the world may see the parts and foundations of that doctrine, in the behalf whereof so many good men have little regarded their own lives : and that all men may understand what manner of people they be, and what opinion they have of God and of religion, whom the bishop of Rome, before they were called to tell their tale, hath condemned for heretics, without any good consideration, without any example, and utterly without law or right, only because he heard tell, that they did dissent from him and his in some point of religion.

M. HARDING.

Two causes
of making
the Apology.

Ye allege two causes : The first is, lest, by holding your peace, ye should seem to grant a fault. The second, which ye make more special, is because by no means ye could have audience in the late general council. Your second cause is false, as hereafter it shall be shewed. Your first is naught, as that which sheweth your pride, vain glory, and pertinacy. Well, ye do but as heretics before you have ever done. It must not be looked for at your hands, that ye acknowledge any fault. For that were humility, which virtue all heretics be far from, &c. To give a voice or suffrage, and utter sentence definitive, it pertaineth only to bishops. Now ye be no bishops, but some of you mere laymen, and most of you apostates.

In councils
any man may
shew his
opinion, but
none may
give a voice
or suffrage,
and sentence
definitive,
but only
bishops.

Whether the ambassadors and divines of the princes of Germany, and of the free cities there, were at any time upon any consideration of their misliked demeanour, or for any other just cause restrained from the company of the fathers in the late general council at Trent : again, whether pope Julius the Third

provided by any writ, that none of your sort should be suffered to speak in the council, the cause of recantation excepted : what ye say touching this matter, because ye say it without proof, we have found you in so many other points of greater importance, so far to step aside from truth, that for this we cannot believe you. But that yourselves by no means could have audience in the council of Trent, and that the ambassadors and divines of the princes and free cities of Germany were from thence quite shut out : how true that is, I report me to the three safe-conducts which the three popes, under whom that council was holden, granted forth and confirmed in that behalf. Wherefore belie the council no more, complaining that ye could not there have audience and be heard.

Ye yield up an account of your faith in writing, ye say. But to whom do ye yield it up ? and by whom is it yielded ? from whom cometh the same ? do ye acknowledge no lawful judge, no lawful consistory in the whole world ? commit ye your whole matter to the temerity of the people ? why have ye not set your names to the book that containeth the profession of your faith and of your whole conscience ?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here M. Harding thought it answer sufficient to upbraid us with suspicion of untruth. Howbeit I have no doubt, but both the truth and the untruth by the particulars will soon appear.

First, that all bishops, having voice definitive and interest in councils, are solemnly sworn in all their decrees and canons to uphold the authority of the pope, he thought it the wisest way to dissemble it. For it had been great want of modesty to deny it. The form of the oath recorded in the pope's own decretals is this : *Ego N. &c. Papatum Romanæ ecclesiæ, et regulas sanctorum patrum adjutor ero ad defendendum, et retinendum, salvo ordine meo, contra omnes homines* : " I N. swear, that I will be an helper to defend and maintain the papacy of the church of Rome, and the rules of the holy fathers" the popes, " mine own order saved, against all men alive"⁹⁶. But these rules

Extra. de
Jurejurand.
Ego N.

⁹⁶ [Barrow (Supremacy) has given the form of what he calls the *new* oath as required of all bishops at their consecration, and of patriarchs and archbishops on receiving the pallium. He remarks

upon the change of the words, as given in the Decretals of Gregory IX. Extra lib. 2. tit. 24. cap. 4. Ego N. (which chap. is quoted from a letter of Gregor. VII. to Petrus Subdiaconus,) "*regulas*

and privileges of the holy fathers the popes are these : ^a that the pope is above all general councils : ^b that his bare will must be holden as a law : ^c that whatsoever he do, no man may say unto him, Why do you this ? ^d that his judgment is more certain than the judgment of all the world : ^e that, if the whole world give sentence in any matter contrary to the pope's pleasure, yet, it seemeth, we are bound to stand to the judgment of the pope : and, ^f as M. Harding saith, that the pope, whatsoever he say or do, as being pope, can never err. These and other the like be the privileges that the pope claimeth unto himself. All which the bishops are bound by oath and by their allegiance to defend against all men alive.

^a Extra. de Elect. et Electi potest. Significasti.
^b Extra. de Translat. Episc. Quanto : In Gloss.
^c Extra. de Conces. Præben. Proposit. In Gloss.
^d Pighius, [Hierarch. Eccl.] lib. 6. cap. 13.
^e Quæst. 3. Nemo. In Gloss.
^f M. Harding, fol. 334 b.

Now, where you say, that bishops only have sentence definitive in the council, ye seem willingly, and without cause to report untruth. For Æneas Sylvius, being himself afterward pope, and named Pius Secundus, would have told you the contrary. These be his words : *Apparet, alios quam episcopos in conciliis habuisse vocem decidentem* : "It is plain, that certain others beside bishops had voice definitive in the councils."

Æneas Sylv. de Gestis. Concil. Basl. lib. 1. [p. 27 c.]

Addition. ¶ In the report hereof M. Harding hath found great advantage. "For when he wrote that book," saith he, "he was Æneas Sylvius Picolomineus, not Pius Secundus. And afterward being pope, he recanted that error." Thus, good reader, thou seest the man is all one : but his name is changed. Yet here is matter sufficient to raise a tragedy. First, touching his name, it forceth not greatly. Neither was Paul an apostle when he was born at Tharsus in Cilicia. Yet notwithstanding St. Augustine

M. Harding, fol. 99 b.

"sanctorum patrum," into "regalia Sancti Petri;" and he appears to think that the present oath is not much older than the time of Clement VIII. from whose Pontificale he quotes. The form "regalia Sancti Petri" occurs however in the Pontificale of Venet. 1561, and, what is more remarkable, in the oath taken by the archbishop of Aquileia in the council of Rome, under Gregory VII.

A. D. 1079 (the council in which Berengarius was condemned). See Mansi, xx. 526. The last correctors of the Canon Law say, that the phrase "regulas sanctorum patrum" is a clerical error from mistaking the abbreviation R. S. P. It seems hardly likely that the same pope, Gregory VII., should have prescribed two different forms of oath.]

Augustin. de
Consensu
Evang. lib. 2.
cap. 17. [iii.
pt. 2. 48.]

saith : *Dicimus Paulum apostolum in Tharso Ciliciæ fuisse natum* : “ We say that Paul the apostle was born in the country of Cilicia, and in the city of Tharsus.” Such quarrels are scarcely meet for children.

“ But afterward,” saith M. Harding, “ being pope, he recanted this error.” No doubt upon great deliberation and good advice. For being one of the council of Basil, he said : “ The council is above the pope.” Afterward being pope himself, he was better instructed : “ I see,” said he, “ before I was much deceived. Now the pope is above the council.” Such a thing it is to be rapt up suddenly into the third heavens.

M. Harding,
fol. 100 a.

But forasmuch as M. Harding saith, all this that I have here alleged out of Pius Secundus and Johannes Gerson, is “ little worth stuff,” for so he calleth it, and that I have added to these words, *in conciliis*, of mine own : which words he saith are not found in the author, and that this is “ lying for advantage :” for this is the ordinary modesty of his speech : I have thought it good to lay forth some part of the said words more at large.

De gestis
Concil. Basil.
lib. 1. in Ora-
tio. Arelaten.
In Conciliis.
[pp. 27, 28.]

Thus therefore saith Æneas Sylvius, who afterward was named Pius Secundus : *Nec in conciliis dignitas patrum, sed ratio sectanda est, &c. Nec ego cujusvis episcopi mendacium, quamvis ditissimi, veritati præponam pauperis presbyteri, &c.* : “ In councils reason or truth is to be considered more than the dignity of the prelates. Neither will I more esteem a lie pronounced by a bishop, be he never so rich, than the truth uttered by a poor simple priest. Nor should a bishop disdain, being rude and unlearned, if the people be not ready to follow after him. Nor do you that be bishops despise your inferiors. The first man that died for Christ, and shewed the way unto martyrdom, was not a bishop, but a Levite,” &c. “ And to report unto you some examples of old councils, we shall find in them all, that the bishops were there together with their inferiors,” &c. “ In the Acts of the Apostles thus it is written : It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, ‘ and to us.’ To us, that is to say, to the apostles and elders. Neither doth this word *visum est* signify a consultation, but

Concilliorum.

Et nobis.

a full discussing and decision of the matter. Therefore it appeareth that certain others besides bishops had a voice definitive in the council. And in the Acts, when the apostles had any great matter to determine, they durst not to discuss it by themselves alone, but called the multitude to sit with them," &c. "It appeareth that the apostles gave us an example, that in great weighty matters we should call some others to us. And therefore in the councils that were holden afterward, we find that inferior priests sat together with the bishops," &c.

In Concilio.

In Conciliis.

But here M. Harding findeth fault, that I have corrupted mine author, and thrust in these words, *in conciliis*, of mine own. And yet in the very same place he might have found these very words, *concilium*, *conciliorum*, *in concilio*, *in conciliis*, used sundry times altogether. And indeed the whole speech there is only of councils.

These, good reader, and other like be the errors that Pius, being once pope, would needs recant. Then he saw, that in his councils the dignity of the prelates is more to be weighed than the truth. Then he saw, that a lie pronounced by a bishop being rich, is more to be esteemed than the truth uttered by a simple priest. Then he saw, that a priest, being himself unlearned and ignorant, ought to disdain, if the people be not ready to follow after him. These be the things that he recanted.

The pope's recantation.

Howbeit M. Harding telleth us, these are not the words of Æneas Sylvius, but of one Ludovicus the cardinal of Arles. And this he reckoneth for a great main lie. Here may I easily answer M. Harding: If this were not Æneas Sylvius' own saying, why then did he, as you have confessed, recant it afterward? If he did afterward recant it, how may it appear it was not his own? are popes so full of humility that they will recant words they never spake? ☞

M. Harding, fol. 100 a.

M. Harding, fol. 99 b.

Likewise saith Gerson: *Etiam ad laicos hoc potest extendi, et plus aliquando quam ad multos clericorum*: "This" (privilege of giving sentence in council) "may be extended even unto the lay sort: yea and that oftentimes better than unto many priests." But hereafter more at large.

Johan. Gerson. Quæ veritates sint credendæ. Corol. 4. [tom. i. p. 419. A.]

M. Harding,
100 b.

Addition. ¶ Hereto saith M. Harding: "You falsely, *Addition.*
impudently, and foully belie Gerson, for Gerson in this
place speaketh not of the authority of giving sentence defi-
nitive in general council." *The answer.* It is reason that
M. Harding make dole of lies at his pleasure. Verily thus
much at least Gerson saith: "The deliberation, or con-
ference and knowledge of matters of faith, may belong to
the lay people, and unto them much more, and better
sometime, than to many priests." This, M. Harding, is as
much as I either say or can require, and this is enough,
unless ye think your priests have authority to judge and
conclude without knowledge, for so seemeth Gerson by
his division to allow conclusion and judgment to the
priests, and deliberation and knowledge to the people. ¶

Sallust. in
Bello Catilin.

But whether we be bishops or no, M. Harding is no
competent nor indifferent judge. For whoso will judge
uprightly must be void of anger, hatred, love, envy, and
other like affections. Which sentence, being otherwise
profane, is used and allowed by the apostolic legates in the
council of Trident. Surely the godly say, that as your
bishops do no part of bishops' duty, and therefore indeed
are no bishops at all; so your late covent at Trident, what-
soever glorious name it pleaseth you to give it, yet not-
withstanding indeed and verily was no council.

Concil. Tri-
dent. sub
Paulo 3.
[Crabb. iii.
970.]

Brene Julii 3.
Citatur a
Calvino.

Whether pope Julius by his bull utterly embarred the
divines and ambassadors of the princes and free cities of
Germany from all audience and disputation in the council
or no, I report me to pope Julius' own bull touching the
same. His words be these: *Erit concilium, ut qui temere
loquuti sunt, aut dicta recantaturi veniant, aut eorum inau-
dita causa, in executionem jam ordinarum constitutionum
hæretici declarentur et condemnentur*: "There shall be a
council, that they that have spoken rashly, either may
recant their sayings, or else without further hearing or
reasoning of the matter, they may be denounced and con-
demned for heretics, according to the constitutions already
made⁹⁷."

Likewise saith John Sleidan, touching the conference

⁹⁷ [The Editor has not succeeded in finding this bull of Julius III.]

had sometime at Augusta: *In colloquio frequenter ad initium actionis hoc dicebant: nolle se vel tantillum de opinione et doctrina sua decedere: sed quicquid facerent, eo fieri, ut in sententiam suam nos adducerent*: “In the conference that was had between us and them, they told us at the first, that they would not yield one whit from their opinion and doctrine, but that, whatsoever they did, they did it only to the intent to bring us to their judgment.”

I could farther allege Matthias Flacius Illyricus, Johannes Fabritius Montanus, Petrus Paulus Vergerius, the bishop of Justinopolis, to like purpose: but perhaps M. Harding would refuse their authorities, and call them partial: yet in a matter so evident, and so openly known, it had been great folly for them to dissemble. Illyricus saith: *Nostri audiri non potuerunt, quamvis id amplissimi Cæsaris legati orarent*: “Our divines and orators could in no wise be heard, notwithstanding the emperor’s most worthy ambassadors had desired it⁹⁸.” Johannes Fabritius saith: *Fateor extensionem factam esse ad alias nationes: sed tamen additur, eam formam non nisi ad illos pertinere, qui resipiscere, et ad ecclesiæ gremium redire velint*: “I grant the safe-conduct was extended to other nations: but it is added withal, that the same form or liberty should pertain to none others, but only to them that would repent and return to the bosom of the church.” And again he saith: *Tantum aberant ab arce disputationum, ut ne ad vestibulum quidem accedere potuerint*: “The divines of the princes of Germany were kept so far off from the high castle of disputation, that they could not be suffered to approach to the entry.” Petrus Paulus Vergerius saith: That the bishop of Vegla in Dalmatia was sore shaken up in the same council, and threatened with deprivation and other extremities, only for a little inkling of the truth.

Howbeit, what need we more authorities? No man is herein so plain and peremptory as M. Harding himself. This is his determinate answer and full resolution in the

Johan. Sleidan, lib. 13.

Illyricus in Recusatione Concil. Tridentini.

Johan. Fabric. [Montani Oratio, p. 10.]

Petr. Paulus Vergerius de Con. Trident.

⁹⁸ [The Editor has found no copy of this work.]

M. Harding,
fol. 20 b.
M. Harding,
fol. 271 b.

M. Harding,
fol. 274 a.

M. Harding,
fol. 333 b.

Jerem. xliv.
16.

Augustin.
epist. 152.
[li. 457.]

case: "Your reasons are no more to be heard, unless ye repent and revoke your errors." Again: "Our doctrine hath been approved too long to be put a daying in these days." Again: "Such wicked changes as ye have made, it is lawful to make neither with council nor without council." Again: "We tell you, that your change of religion and manifold heresies ought not to have been attempted, nor without the bishop of Rome's commandment, nor with his commandment." These be your words, M. Harding: this, you say, you tell us plainly, and therefore, I trow, we must believe you. And so ye seem to conclude with the words written in the prophet Jeremy: *Non audiemus verbum quod loquutus es nobis in nomine Domini, sed faciendo faciemus omne verbum quod egredietur ex ore nostro*: "We will not hear the word that thou hast spoken to us in the name of the Lord, but we will do every word that shall come from our own mouth."

We may therefore say of you, as St. Augustine sometimes said of the heretics the Donatists: *Cum omnis anima suspensa expectaret in tanta collectione quid ageretur, illi vehementer instabant ut nihil ageretur. Quare hoc? nisi quia causam suam malam sciebant, et facillime se posse convinci, si ageretur, dubitare non poterant?* "When everybody was looking carefully what should be done in so great assembly, they" (the Donatists heretics) "laboured what they could that nothing utterly should be done. And why so? They knew their cause was naught: and could not doubt, but that if any conference or disputation should be had, they should soon be reproved."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 2.

And although St. Hierom would have nobody to be patient when he is suspected of heresy, yet we will deal herein neither bitterly, nor brabblingly, nor yet be carried away with anger and heat, though he ought to be reckoned neither bitter nor brabler that speaketh the truth. We willingly leave this kind of eloquence to our adversaries, who, whatsoever

[Vol. iv. p. 12.]

they say against us, be it never so shrewdly or despitefully said, yet think it is said modestly and comely enough, and care nothing whether it be true or false. We need none of these shifts, which do maintain the truth. Further, if we do shew it plainly, that God's holy gospel, the ancient bishops, and the primitive church do make on our side, and that we have not without just cause left these men, and rather have returned to the apostles and old catholic fathers : and if we shall be found to do the same not colourably, or craftily, but in good faith before God, truly, honestly, clearly, and plainly : and if they themselves which fly our doctrine, and would be called catholics, shall manifestly see how all these titles of antiquity, whereof they boast so much, are quite shaken out of their hands, and that there is more pith in this our cause than they thought for : we then hope and trust that none of them will be so negligent and careless of his own salvation, but he will at length study and bethink himself to whether part he were best to join him. Undoubtedly except one will altogether harden his heart, and refuse to hear, he shall not repent him to give good heed to this our Defence, and to mark well what we say, and how truly and justly it agreeth with Christian religion.

M. HARDING.

I see well we must look to your fingers. Ye spit forth your gall and choler by and by at the first. Through your whole book in word ye pretend truth, zeal, plainness, and sober dealing : but indeed pour out little other than lying, spite, scoffs, and immoderate railing. The effect of the rest is this : ye have joined yourselves to the synagogue of Antichrist : ye serve the stage, ye have begun to play your tragedy on falsely, shamefully, darkly, and guilefully : your brags and promises, your crakes of God's holy word, your errors, your heresies, your contagious poison, your slanders, your new clergy's doctrine, &c.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The saying of St. Hierom is avouched by the like saying of Ruffinus an ancient writer. Thus he saith : *Unam notam hæreseos qui dissimulat, non est Christianus* : “ Whoso dissembleth when he is called heretic, is no Christian man.” For the rest blame me not, good Christian reader, if I use no more words than need requireth. If I thought it worthy the while, I could answer all these things more at large. I trust, in our whole Apology, there appeareth no such immoderate kind of railing. But if I should follow M. Harding’s humour, and write but the one half of that he writeth, then perhaps I might worthily be called a railer.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 2.

For where they call us heretics, it is a crime so ^[Vol. iv. p. 12.] heinous, that unless it may be seen, unless it may be felt, and in manner may be holden with hands and fingers, it ought not lightly to be judged or believed, when it is laid to the charge of any Christian. For heresy is a forsaking of salvation, a renouncing of God’s grace, a departing from the body and Spirit of Christ.

M. HARDING.

The definition ye seem to make of heresy is not sufficient. For as ye define it, so every deadly sin is heresy. For every deadly sin is a forsaking of salvation, a renouncing of God’s grace, a departing from the body and Spirit of Christ. Heresy is a false doctrine against the right belief, by him that professeth the faith stubbornly, either avouched, or called in doubt. In which definition this word “ stubbornly ” is added, because it is not error only in those things that be of faith, but stubbornness in error that maketh an heretic, as St. Augustine teacheth. “ Who,” saith he, “ in the church of Christ, savour any thing that is unwholesome and crooked, if, being sharply admonished to savour that is whole and right, they resist stubbornly, and will not amend their venomous and deadly doctrines, but stand to defend them, they be heretics.” But now the law of upright dealing, especially in God’s cause, so requiring, ye must pardon us, if, as among husbandmen we call a rake, ‘ a rake,’ a spade, ‘ a spade,’

The defender’s definition of heresy found insufficient.

The true definition of heresy.

Lib. 18. de Civit. Dei, cap. 51. [vii. 533.]

a mattock, 'a mattock:' so among divines, we call heresy, 'heresy,' and likewise, falsehood, 'lying,' slandering, 'craft,' hypocrisy, 'apostasy,' malice, 'blasphemy,' every such crime by his proper name, without all glossing.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye say, this is not the right definition of heresy. Verily, M. Harding, this is but a simple quarrel. It was not my mind in this place to utter any definition of heresy, either right or wrong. You know right well that such curiosity in this kind of writing is not needful. It is sufficient our words be true, although they include no definition.

For just proof of heresy three things necessarily are required. First, that it be an error: secondly, that it be an error against the truth of God's word: for otherwise every error maketh not an heresy: thirdly, that it be stoutly and wilfully maintained: otherwise an error in God's truth, without wilful maintenance, is not an heresy. St. Augustine saith: *Errare possum, hæreticus esse non possum* Augustinus. [*quæ ? nolo*]: "In an error I may be: but an heretic I cannot be⁹⁹."

It was not so necessary in this matter, so precisely to seek up definitions. I thought it sufficient only to declare the horror of heresy. For as touching the definition, St. Augustine saith: *Quid sit hæresis* [*leg. quod faciat hæreticum*], *regulari quadam definitione comprehendendi, sicut ego existimo, aut omnino non potest, aut difficillime potest*: Augustin. ad Quodvult-Deum, epist. 2. [viii. 4.] "To express by orderly definition what thing maketh an heretic, as I judge, it is either impossible, or very hard." Therefore you, M. Harding, and your fellows are the more blameworthy, for that of every your phantasies ye have made an heresy. Ludovicus Vives, one of your own school, thus complaineth thereof: *Hæresis nomen rebus levissimis impingitur:.....idem facerent Scotistæ de Thomistis,..... nisi scholarum consuetudo aures emollivisset*: Ludovici Vives, de Corrupt. Artib. [lib. i. p. 30.] "The name of heresy is laid upon every light matter: so would the

⁹⁹ [The Editor has not succeeded in verifying this celebrated saying in any of St. Augustine's writings. It seems to have been handed down amongst theologians without any inquiry as to its origin.]

Scotists handle the Thomists, saying that the custom of the schools hath brought their ears in ure." Thus pope Nicolas saith: *Qui Romanæ ecclesiæ privilegium auferre conatur, hic proculdubio labitur in hæresim*: "Whosoever goeth about to abrogate the privilege of the church of Rome, he no doubt is an heretic."

Dist. 22.
Omn.

That ye speak of stubbornness in defence of heresy, I pray God, M. Harding, it do not over near touch yourself. I pray God you do not wilfully defend that thing, wherein you know and see manifest and open error. Verily St. Hierom saith: *Quicumque aliter scripturam intelligit, quam sensus Spiritus Sancti flagitat, quo scripta est, licet ab ecclesia non recesserit, tamen hæreticus appellari potest*: "Whosoever expoundeth the scriptures otherwise than the sense of the Holy Ghost, by whom they were written, doth require, although he be not yet departed from the church, yet may he well be called an heretic."

24. Quæst. 3.
Hæresis.

Tertull. de
Virginib. Ve-
landis. [sub
init. p. 172.]

Udalricus
Augustanus
Episcopus ad
Nicola. Pa-
pam. [p. iv.]

Hilari. de
Trinitate,
lib. 6. [p.
911.]

Likewise the old father Tertullian saith: *Quicquid contra veritatem sapit, hæresis est, etiam vetus consuetudo*: "Whatsoever thing savoureth against the truth, it is an heresy, be it never so much an old custom." Likewise your tyrannical and filthy restraining of priests' lawful marriage, Udalricus the bishop of Augusta calleth, *Periculosum hæresis decretum*: "A dangerous decree of heresy¹."

Now touching simple error and wilful defence, St. Hilary saith: *Illis in eo quod nesciunt potest adhuc in tuto esse salus, si credant; tibi vero jam omnia ad salutem clausa sunt, qui negas quod jam ignorare non potes*: "They, forsomuch as they know not the truth, may have their salvation in safety, if afterward they believe: but all hope of health is shut from thee, forasmuch as thou deniest that thing that thou canst not choose but know."

To conclude, unto you, M. Harding, who oftentimes of small errors, oftentimes of undoubted and known truths,

¹ ["Ignorant enim quod periculosum hujus hæresis decretum "a sancto Gregorio factum con-
"digno pœnitentiæ fructu postmo-
"dum ab eodem sit purgatum."
S. Udalricus Augustanus, fl. sæc. 9.

The letter is printed at the end of Calixti Tract. de Conjugio sacerdotum. See the argument of Calixtus in favour of its genuineness, p. 502. *ibid.*]

without regard of definition, have fancied great and horrible heresies, Alphonsus de Castro, a doctor of your own, saith thus : *Idcirco fit, ut hi qui tam leviter de hæresi pronunciant, non expendentes de qua re loquantur, sæpe suæ ipsorum sagitta feriantur, incidantque in eam foream quam aliis parabant. Nam velle humanas scripturas in divinarum ordinem connumerare, hoc verius ego dixerim hæresim : quod faciunt hi qui humanis scriptis dissentire impium autumant, perinde ac divinis* : “Therefore it happeneth that they that so rashly pronounce and call every thing heresy, not considering whereof they speak, be often stricken with their own dart, and fall into the same pit that themselves have digged for others. For this would I rather call heresy, to account men’s writings among the scriptures of God. So do they, that think it a wicked matter to dissent from the writings of man, no less than if it were the judgment of God.”

Alphonsus de Castro de Hære. lib. 1. cap. 7. p. 79. [p. 38. ed. 1571.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 3.

But this was ever an old and solemn property with them and their forefathers : if any did complain of their errors and faults, and desired to have true religion restored, straightway to condemn such for heretics, as men newfangled and factious. Christ for no other cause was called a Samaritan, but only for that he was thought to have fallen to a certain new religion, and to be the author of a new sect. And Paul the apostle of Christ was called before the judges, to make answer to a matter of heresy : and therefore he said : According to this way, which they call heresy, I do worship the God of my fathers, believing all things which be written in the law and in the prophets.

Acts xxiv. 14.

M. HARDING.

The defenders' predecessors.

If ye mean Huss, Hierom of Prague, Wickliffe, Almaric, Abailard, the Apostolics, Peterbrusians, Berengarians, Waldenses,

Albingsenses, Imagebreakers, or such like, which ever found fault with the church in their time, and cried for a restoring of religion, as though it had been quite lost, and would themselves have the glory of it, by bringing in their heresy in place of the catholic doctrine, under the name of God's word, which hath always been the property of all heretics : if, I say, ye mean these, or any of these, we also call them heretics, and for such we condemn them.

But sirs, ye forget yourselves foully. How agreeth this with that ye say hereafter oftentimes, that the light of the truth was quite put out, and that Luther and Zuinglius first brought the gospel abroad into the world? Contradiction found in the defenders.

Were it true that Christ was called a Samaritan for the cause ye assign, thereof what conclude ye? We see where about ye go. Ye would seem to join with Christ, with Paul, and with the first Christians. But truly they refuse your company.

But we tell you, Christ was the true Samaritan indeed, that is to say, the keeper, as he that is Keeper of mankind : and therefore he shunned not the name : yet was he not a Samaritan as the Jews meant. Paul likewise, (who was not as ye say, to speak properly, called before the judges to make answer to a matter of heresy,) being accused to Felix by Tertullus that he was of the sect or heresy of the Nazarenes, (so were the Christians first called,) did not only not deny, but openly confessed, that according to that way, or state of life, which the Jews called a sect or heresy, he worshipped God. For it is to be considered, that in those times the name of heresy was not so infamous, as it may be judged by the place of the Acts, chap. v., unless somewhat be added whereby it may be understood to be taken in rate of a vice, as 1 Cor. xi. Galat. v. So the word was then indifferent, and might be taken in good part, or evil part. Tertullian useth it in good part, where, speaking of the Christians, he calleth them *sectam*, "a sect," into which Latin word the Greek word *hæresis* is turned. Now these examples of Christ, Paul, and the first Christians serve not your defence. Christ was called of the Jews a Samaritan, unworthily after the sense of their thought : ye are called heretics worthily. Paul burdened with the name of heresy, forasmuch as thereby was signified the kind of life of those that believed in Christ, the word being indifferent, was honoured rather than reviled. And Tertullian calleth the Christian people a sect (as he might) without blemish, or note of any evil. Your case is not like : for ye are charged with heresy, as it is taken in the worst part. Apologet. cap. 21. [p. 18.] Secta.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

O how many waste words hath M. Harding to spare ! Here, once again, he cometh in with Huss, Hierom of Prague, Wickliffe, Almaric, Abailard, Apostolics, Peter-

brusians, Berengarians, Waldenses, Albingenses, Image-breakers, to fray his simple reader with a terror of strange names. We say, Luther and Zuinglius were the first publishers of the gospel: and yet again we say, the same Luther and Zuinglius were not the first. We have forgotten ourselves foully. We write contradiction against ourselves. We would seem to join with Christ and Paul, but truly they refuse our company. And so forth, I know not what.

Verily, M. Harding, we never said Luther and Zuinglius were the first publishers of the gospel. If we should so say, we should report untruth, as you do often. Christ and his apostles were the first.

Addition.

Addition.  M. Harding: "A great untruth. You say no less, p. 17. Thus doctor Luther began to preach the gospel of Christ. If he that beginneth to publish be the first publisher, then you said that Luther was the first publisher." *The answer.* It is a great loss of time, M. Harding, to quarrel at words, yourself being assured of the meaning. You know well, I meant not that doctor Luther was the first man that ever preached the gospel of Christ. For Christ himself, and his apostles were before him. But thus I say: In this latter age, after your so long darkness, he was the first. But I have said: "Doctor Luther began to publish the gospel." There, you say, by mine own confession, doctor Luther was the first publisher of the gospel. Gravity, M. Harding, and sober dealing would become you better. I say, he began: *ergo*, say you, he was the first. How followeth this conclusion of these premises? That you may understand your error by the like, St. Peter saith: *Incipiam vos commonere*: "I will begin to advertise you." Will you conclude hereof that St. Peter advertised them never before, or that no man ever gave them advertisement before St. Peter? In the Acts of the Apostles it is written thus: "Peter and John were beginning to enter into the temple." Will you therefore tell us, that Peter and John were never in the temple before that day? or that no man ever came there before them? This is not that gravity, M. Harding, that you have

M. Harding,
fol. 101 b.

² Pet. 1.
[Vulg.]

Acts iii. 3.
Incipientes
introtire in
templum.
[Vulg.]

professed unto the world. Having respect to these latter days, doctor Luther was the first that preached the gospel. But having respect to the gospel itself, so doctor Luther was not the first. For it had been preached by Christ and his apostles, and by infinite other holy fathers, many hundred years before Luther was born. ¶

These worthy and learned fathers, Luther and Zuinglius, and other like godly and zealous men, were appointed of God, not to erect a new church, but to reform the old, whereof you have made a cave of thieves: to kindle again the light that you had quenched, and to bear witness to the truth of God.

You say, Christ and Paul will none of our company: as if you were privy of their counsel. But perhaps, M. Harding, this is *clavis errans*, and therefore can neither open nor shut: or, as St. Hierom saith: *Pars aliqua supercilii Pharisæici*: "Some part of the high looks of the Pharisees²." Christ himself hath said: "Whoso loveth me will keep my word, and my Father loveth him: and my Father and I will come to him, and dwell with him." St. Peter saith: "Whoso trusteth in him shall not be confounded."

Of Abailard and Almaric, and certain other your strange names, if they have taught any thing contrary to the truth of God, we have no skill: they are none of ours. Of John Huss, Hierom of Prague, and Berengarius, and other like virtuous learned men, we have no cause to be ashamed. Their doctrine standeth still, and increaseth daily, because it is of God. But as for yours, because it is only of yourselves, (for it is known for the most part of what time, and under what pope each thing first began, as your transubstantiation under pope Innocentius the Third, anno 1214, &c.) therefore it falleth daily, and is now forsaken the world through.

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding crieth out impatiently: *Addition.* "The more is your shame, if any spark of shame be left in you. Neither the whore taketh shame of her filthiness.

² [Hieronym. "Istum locum "telligentes aliquid sibi de Phari-
"Episcopi et presbyteri non in- "sæorum assumunt supercilio."]

Hieronym.
in 16. cap.
Matt. [iv.
75.]
John xiv. 23.

1 Pet. II. 6.

M. Harding
[Detect.]
fol. 103 a.

Thou hast gotten thee a whore's forehead. Past-shame wretches." 

You say that the simple name of sect or heresy, where-with St. Paul was charged, was not so infamous or odious in those days, and that Tertullian called the religion of Christ a sect or heresy, without any manner blemish, or note of evil. It was needless for M. Harding to avouch untruth so earnestly without cause.

I grant, the name of heresy or sect among the philosophers was not infamous. Cicero saith: *Cato.....in ea hæresi est, quæ nullum sequitur florem orationis.* But in Cicer. in Pa-
radox. [in
præf.] case of religion it was evermore amongst all men taken in ill part, and condemned, and counted odious. Touching St. Paul, in how good part the Jews called him heretic, it may easily appear by these words of Tertullus his accuser: *Invenimus hunc virum pestilentem, et moventem seditionem omnibus Judæis per universum orbem, ac principem sectæ Nazaræorum:* "We have found this man to be a pestilent and a wicked fellow, moving sedition among the Jews throughout the whole world, and a captain of the heresy of the Nazarenes." In such good part they said unto Christ: Art thou greater than was our father Abraham? John viii. 53. thou art a false prophet, and deceivest the people: thou John vii. 20. art a Samaritan, and hast the devil.

The like good part Christ promised aforehand to his disciples: They shall cast you out of their synagogues: ye John xvi. 2. shall be hated of all men for my name's sake. In such Matt. x. 22. good part and meaning was St. Paul called an heretic. And so, M. Harding, besides others, your own doctor Nicolaus Lyra would soon have told you.

But much more I marvel ye should so unadvisedly say that Tertullian called the Christian people a sect or heresy in good part, and, as you say, without any blemish, or note of evil. For the same Tertullian in the same Apology saith, the heathens commonly called the Christians *incestos, homicidas, infanticidas, sacrilegos, pessimos, nocentissimos, publicum odium, hostes humani generis*³, *omnium* Nicol. Lyra
in 24. cap.
Actor. [vi.
1229.] Tertull. in
Apologetico.
[cap. 2. p. 4.]

³ [The first part of this quotation is the substance of what Tertullian says in different parts of the Apologeticus.]

scelerum reos; deorum, imperatorum, legum, morum, naturæ totius inimicos: “advourerous against kind, mankillers, killers of children, churchrobbers, most wicked, most hurtful, the public hatred, the enemies of mankind, guilty of all kind of wickedness: enemies against the gods, against the emperors, against the laws, against good order, against nature itself.” Wheresoever they saw them they made an outcry upon them: *Christianos ad leonem: non licet esse Christianos*: “Have these Christians to the lion: it is not lawful these Christians should live.” So St. Augustine saith: *Factum est vulgi proverbium, Pluvia defecit causa Christianorum*: “It is now become a common proverb among the people, Our rain faileth us because of these Christians.” So Eusebius saith: The religion of Christ was called *impiorum Christianorum hæresis*: “the heresy of the godless Christians⁴.” These words, M. Harding, I trow were never uttered without all manner blemish, and note of evil. St. Hierom saith: *Quod magis mirum sit, etiam illud de Actibus Apostolorum videtur esse relegendum, fidem nostram in Christum et ecclesiasticam disciplinam jam tunc a perversis hominibus hæresim nuncupatam*: “And that we may the more marvel, we may once again read this place of the Acts of the Apostles, where we find that the Christian faith and ecclesiastical discipline was even then of wicked men called a heresy.”

Even as rightly, M. Harding, and upon as good grounds you have again this day condemned the same gospel of Christ, and in as good part and meaning have called it heresy. But we may truly and simply say with St. Paul: Acts xxiv. 14. “According to this sect, which you call heresy, we worship the God of our fathers, which is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. *Divis.* 1.

.....⁵ But the more sore and outrageous a crime^[Vol. 1v. p. 13.] heresy is, the more it ought to be proved by plain

⁴ Eusebius. . . . λέγοντες αἵρεσιν ἄθεον Χριστιανῶν πεφάνθαι.]

⁵ [Here a few unimportant lines of the Apology are omitted.]

Tertull. in Apologetico. [cap. 40. p. 32.]

Augustin. de Civitat. lib. 2. cap. 3. [viii. 33.]

Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 18. [1. 180.]

Hieronym. in Epist. ad Tit. cap. 3. [iv. pt. 2. 438.]

and strong arguments, especially in this time, when men begin to give less credit to their words, and to make more diligent search of their doctrine than they were wont to do. For the people of God are otherwise instructed now, than they were in times past, when all the bishops of Rome's sayings were allowed for gospel, and when all religion did depend only upon their authority. Now-a-days the holy scripture is abroad, the writings of the apostles and prophets are in print, whereby all truth and catholic doctrine may be proved, and all heresy may be disproved and confuted.

M. HARDING.

Where ye require your heresy, for so much as it is so heinous a crime, by plain and strong arguments to be proved, it is not unknown how sufficiently and substantially that is performed already by men of excellent learning, as well of this age, as of times past. Was not Berengarius, the first author of your sacramentary heresy, by most plain and strong arguments confuted of Lanfrancus bishop of Canterbury, and Guimundus bishop of Aversa? were not the Peterbrusians so, whose heresy ye hold against the blessed sacrifice of the mass, of the learned abbot Petrus Cluniacensis? was not Wickliffe so of Thomas Walden, a learned man of England? hath not Luther and Æcolampadius been so confuted in our time of that holy and learned father bishop Fisher?

But what shall I speak of particular men, were they never so excellent, by whom they have been confuted, sith by public sentence of the church they have been condemned, both in general and provincial councils? Therefore we think it not needful now again to prove your doctrine, so sufficiently condemned, to be heresy. That the people be now otherwise instructed than they were in times past, we confess. But whether better now than in our forefathers' days, they that can consider the lives of them now, and of them that were then, may easily judge.

The sayings of the bishop of Rome were never allowed for the gospel. His private sayings and common talk might be erroneous, no less than other men's. But what he said by way of judgment and sentence definitive in doubtful points touching religion, such sayings of Peter's successor (for whom Christ prayed that his faith might not fail, and who was commanded by Christ to strengthen his brethren) we take for truth, and the same obediently receive. So the fathers assembled in council at Chalcedon,

The defend-
ers' heresies
sufficiently
and fully
confuted
already by
sundry great
clerks.
Lanfrancus.
Guimundus.
Petrus Clu-
niacensis.
Thomas
Walden.
Bishop Fish-
er.

In what case
the pope's
sayings are
to be taken
for truth.

Luke xxii.

Untruth.

received and agreed to the saying and writing of pope Leo, no less than if Peter the apostle and first bishop of Rome himself had spoken. The pope's authority we acknowledge as supreme above all other authority in earth, touching the government of the church : yet was it never said ne thought by the catholics that all religion depended only thereon, as your slanderous report beareth men in hand.

Untruth.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Lanfrancus, Guimundus, Abbas Cluniacensis, Thomas Waldensis, John Fisher, and other your like doctors, M. Harding, are over young, all within the space of these last five hundred years, far unlike St. Augustine, St. Hierom, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, and others the ancient learned fathers and doctors of the church. Neither is there any sufficient cause to the contrary, but that Berengarius, John Wickliffe, John Huss, doctor Luther, Zuinglius, Œcolampadius, and others, either for learning, or for truth, or for judgment in the scriptures, or for antiquity, may well and safely be compared with them. At the least I hope we may say of them, as St. Augustine once said of the doctors and fathers of his time : *Neque quorumlibet disputationes, quamvis catholicorum et laudatorum hominum, velut scripturas canonicas habere debemus : ut nobis non liceat, salva honorificentia, quæ illis debetur, aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare aut respuere, si forte invenerimus quod aliter senserint quam veritas habet* : “Neither weigh we the writings of all men, be they never so worthy and catholic, as we weigh the canonical scriptures : but that, saving the reverence that is due unto them, we may mislike and refuse somewhat in their writings, if we happen to find that they have thought otherwise than the truth may bear.”

Augustin. ad
Fortunatian.
epist. 3. [*leg.*
epist. 111.
tom. ii. 502.]

Likewise the councils ye mean are very new, and therefore bear the less authority, for that they be so many ways contrary to the old. Hereof hereafter more at large. Certainly there is none of your errors so gross and palpable, but by some of your late councils it hath been confirmed.

M. Harding,
[Detect.]
fol. 111 b.

Addition. ☞ “This talk,” saith M. Harding, “is Lucifer-*Addition.*
like, and saucy, and malapert. For wherein,” saith he,

“are the late councils so many ways contrary to the old?”
The answer. He might as well have demanded, Wherein is darkness so many ways contrary to the light? for is he so great a stranger in these cases? I doubt not but he doth well remember it was decreed in the old council of Africa, that no priest should appeal out of that country to the bishop of Rome. Likewise it is concluded in the old councils holden at Tella⁶, Hippo and Milevitum, that no priest should appeal, but only to the councils holden in Africa. But the later new councils have made it lawful to appeal to the pope from the furthest ends of the world. And pope Pius II. and pope Julius II. have solemnly determined, that whoso appealeth from the pope to a council, shall be judged an heretic.

The old council of Nice alloweth the bishop of Rome equal power with the other three patriarchs, making every of them within their own provinces in jurisdiction and authority like unto other. But the later new councils have made the same bishop of Rome head and prince over all primates and patriarchs throughout the world. And M. Harding saith, the said patriarchs were only the pope’s deputies, that is to say, served him at commandment as his men. And in the late new council of Lateran under pope Leo these words are openly pronounced, and well allowed of: *In papa est omnis potestas supra omnes potestates, tam cœli, quam terræ*: “In the pope there is all power above all powers, as well of heaven as of earth.” The like might be said of private mass, of the half communion, of transubstantiation, and of the rest. But by these few we may easily see how near the new councils resemble the old. ➡

Therefore we may justly say to you, as St. Augustine sometime said to Maximinus the Arian heretic: *Nec ego Nicœnam synodum tibi, nec tu mihi Ariminensem debes, tanquam præjudicaturus, objicere. Scripturarum autoritatibus res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet*: “Neither may I lay to thee the council of Nice, nor mayest

Concil. Afric.
cap. 92. [iv.
507.]

Concil. Te-
len. cap. 17.
Concil. Mile-
vet. cap. 22.
[iv. 332.]
In Bulla
Leonis X.

Ruffinus I.
[leg. lib. x.]
cap. 6.

M. Harding
in his an-
swer, art. 4.
fol. 86 b.

Concil. Late-
ran. sub Leo.
X. sess. 10.
[Harduin,
IX. 1789.]
In Oratione
Episcopi
Patracensis.

Augustin.
contra Maxi-
min. lib. 3.
cap. 14. [viii.
704.]

⁶ [Supra, vol. ii. p. 223, note 49.]

thou lay to me the council of Ariminum, either of us thinking thereby to find prejudice against the other. But let us lay matter to matter, cause to cause, and reason to reason, by the authority of the scriptures."

Yet we say not, as you, M. Harding, would fain gather, that St. Augustine by these words despised the authority of the Nicene council. For certainly he had it ever, as we also have it, in great reverence. But thus we say : St. Augustine, disputing with an heretic as we do with you, and seeing that councils might be alleged against councils, as the council of Ariminum against the council of Nice, was therefore contented, not to use the authority of any council at all, but, as himself saith, by the authority of the scriptures to lay matter to matter, and cause to cause.

M. Harding,
[Detect.]
fol. 112 b.

Addition. ☞ "The council of Ariminum, though there were at it eight hundred bishops, yet was it allowed for no council," saith M. Harding, "for want of Damasus the pope's confirmation, as Sozomenus and Theodoretus have witnessed." *The answer.* Here, M. Harding, you have conveyed in a pretty fitton, under some colour of truth : both Theodoretus and Sozomenus will reprove you. For the council of Ariminum was misliked, not only for that it was not confirmed by the pope, as ye would seem to tell us, but also for that it lacked the confirmation of sundry others. Sozomenus saith thus : "They allow not the decrees of the council of Ariminum, for that neither the bishop of Rome nor other bishops had consented unto it, and for that the said decrees had misliked many that were there assembled." To like purpose writeth also Theodoretus, and in manner with like words. I grant the bishop of Rome was the chief. Yet his only authority was not sufficient to allow or disallow general councils. For, as it appeareth by your own authors, the consent of others was required thereto as well as his. Thus, M. Harding, ye seek unduly to beguile the simple by untrue report. ☞

Sozomen.
lib. 6. cap.
23. [li. 246.]
ὥς μήτε Ῥω-
μαίων ἐπι-
σκοποῦ μήτε
τῶν ἁλλῶν
συνθεμένων
αὐτοῖς καὶ
ὥς πολλῶν
τῶν αὐτοῦ
συνελθόν-
των ἀπαρε-
σκόντων
τοῖς τότε
παρ' αὐτῶν
δεδογμένοις.
Theodoretus,
lib. 2. cap.
21. [iii. 103.]

Chrysost. in
Psal. ix. [v.
110.]

Ye grant there is more light and knowledge now than was before. The greater is either your fault or your folly, M. Harding, that in the broad day and open light so busily set forth the works of darkness. St. Chrysostom saith : *Hic*

est multo impudentior. Ex furibus enim leges eos gravius puniunt qui interdum furantur : “ He is very shameless that worketh deceit in the open light. For of all thieves the law most sharply punisheth them that rob in the day time.”

Therefore St. Cyprian saith unto you : *Ignosci potuit simpliciter erranti :.....post inspirationem vero et revelationem factam, qui in eo quod erraverat perseverat prudens et sciens, sine venia ignorantie peccat : presumptione enim atque obstinatione.....superatur* : “ He that is deceived, and erreth of simplicity, may be pardoned : but after that the truth is once revealed, whoso continueth nevertheless in his former error wittingly and willingly, sinneth without pardon of ignorance, as being overcome by presumption and wilfulness⁷.”

Cyprian ad
Jubalanum.
[p. 133.]

You say, notwithstanding all this great light we talk of, yet our lives are nothing comparable to the lives of them that have been before us. This, M. Harding, hath ever been an old complaint in all ages, as may appear by St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, and other ancient fathers. It was a common proverb in old times : *Tὰ πέρυσι βελτίω* : “ Things a year past are evermore better than things present.” For every thing to us seemeth the greater as it seemeth nearest to touch our senses. And because we feel not our fathers’ evils, therefore we imagine they had no evil at all. The wise man saith : *Ne dixeris, quæ causa est quod priora tempora meliora fuerint quam præsentia. Stulta enim est hujusmodi interrogatio* : “ Never demand wherefore the times past were better than the times present. For indeed it is a foolish question.”

Cyprian ad
Demetrian.
[p. 217.]
Augustin. de
Civit. Dei.

But, M. Harding, wherefore do you thus condemn our lives in respect of our fathers? Certainly you must needs confess there are fewer blasphemies, fewer oaths, fewer breaches of matrimony, fewer stews, fewer concubines, fewer frays, fewer murders amongst us this day than commonly were at any time among our fathers. Howbeit, to let our fathers pass, if it shall please you to lay our lives to your lives, although we acknowledge many our imperfec-

Eccles. vii.
10.

⁷ [The conclusion of the passage “obstinatione quadam nititur, cum is incorrectly quoted; it should be, “ratione superatur.”]

tions, yet, God's name be blessed, we have no cause to fly the comparison.

The pope's words, you say, were never taken for gospel. Yes, M. Harding, and somewhat also above the gospel. For proof whereof it may please you to remember the words of certain your late doctors. Sylvester Prierias, late master of pope Leo's palace, writeth thus: *Indulgentiæ autoritate scripturæ non innotuere nobis, sed autoritate ecclesiæ Romanæ, Romanorumque pontificum, quæ major est*: "Pardons are not warranted unto us by the authority of God's word, but by the authority of the Roman church, and of the bishops of Rome, which is more than God's word^s." If this be not sufficient, he addeth further: *A doctrina Romanæ ecclesiæ et Romani pontificis sacra scriptura robur et auctoritatem trahit*: "The holy scripture taketh strength and authority of the doctrine of the bishop and church of Rome."

Sylvester
Prierias con-
tra Luthere-
rum. [fund.
3.]

Albertus
Pighius Hie-
rarch. lib. 1.
cap. 2.

Your greatest doctor Albertus Pighius saith: *Apostoli quædam conscripserunt, non ut scripta illa præessent fidei et religioni nostræ, sed potius ut subessent*: "The apostles wrote certain things, not to the end that such writings should be over our faith and religion, but rather that they should be under." Your canonists say: ^a *Papa potest dispensare contra jus divinum*; "The pope may dispense against the law of God⁹:" ^b *Papa potest dispensare contra jus naturæ*; "The pope may dispense against the law of nature:" ^c *Papa potest dispensare contra apostolum*; "The pope may dispense against St. Paul the apostle:" ^d *Papa potest dispensare contra Novum Testamentum*; "The pope may dispense against the New Testament:" ^e *Papa potest dispensare de omnibus præceptis Veteris et Novi Testamenti*; "The pope may dispense with all the commandments, both of the Old, and also of the New Testament." Hereof more hereafter, as farther occasion shall be offered.

a 16. quæst.
1. Quæcun-
que: in Gloss.

b 15. quæst.
6. Authorit.
in Gloss.

c Dist. 34.
Lector: et
dist. 82. Pres-
byter.

d Abbas Pa-
nor. Extra
[lib. 4.] de
Divortilis,
ca. fin. [fol.
54. col. 1.]
e Summa
Angel. in
dictione
Papæ.

These be your own doctors' words, M. Harding: they be

⁸ [Sylvester Prierias, supra, vol. 1. 361.] "quod privilegium concedatur
⁹ [The passage in the Gloss is in the margin "Privilegium contra
"sed forte non est absurdum, "jus divinum concedi potest."]

truly reported : they be no slanders. And therefore Franciscus Zabarella, a cardinal of Rome, saith thus : *† Persuaserunt pontificibus quod omnia possent, et sic quod facerent quicquid liberet, etiam illicita, et sint* [leg. sic] *plusquam Deus* : “They have made the popes believe that they might do all things whatsoever they listed, yea notwithstanding they were things unlawful : and thus have they made them more than God¹⁰.”

f Franciscus Zabarella. [de Schism. Pontif. p. 243. col. 1. B.]

You say, The pope in his common talk may be deceived, and err as other men may : but in his judgment-seat and sentence definitive of religion, he cannot err : as if ye would say, The pope hath one spirit in the consistory, and another at home : much like as one said sometimes unto Cicero in reproach of his inconstancy : *Aliud stans aliud sedens de republica loqueris* : “Touching the common-weal, ye have one mind sitting, and another standing.”

Sallust. in Ciceronem.

But Christ said unto Peter : “I have prayed for thee, that thy faith should not fail.” Therefore, say you, we receive obediently whatsoever the pope speaketh in place of judgment. Hereby ye seem to give us secretly to understand that Christ’s prayers were available for the pope, to keep him from error, not in the church, or pulpit, or closet, or any other common or private place, but only in the consistory and council, in debating doubtful cases of religion.

Luke xxii. 32.

But how holdeth this argument ? Christ prayed for Peter that his faith should not fail : *ergo*, the pope cannot err. Verily St. Augustine saith : *Nunquid pro Petro rogabat : pro Johanne et Jacobo non rogabat ? Ut de cæteris taceamus* : “What, did Christ pray for Peter, and did he not pray for John and James ? I will not speak of the rest¹¹.” Neither did Christ pray for Peter only, or for the apostles, but for all the faithful that ever should be, as

Augustin. in Qu. Novi Test. q. 75. [iii. app. 73.]

¹⁰ [Franciscus Zabarella fl. A.D. 1400. Bishop Jewel apparently found this passage quoted in Flac. Illyricus de Sectis, p. 115. The reading there is “*sint* plusquam “Deus ;” in the original work as

printed in the Syntagma Tractt. de Imperiali Jurisdictione, Argentor. 1609. Bodl., the reading is *sic*.]

¹¹ [These Quæstiones are not genuine.]

John xvii. 20. himself saith: "I pray not only for them, but also for all them that through their preaching shall believe in me."

Howbeit, what, saith M. Harding, he so obediently receiveth the pope's decrees? Ye wiss, the popes themselves will not so receive them. Platina saith: *Acta priorum pontificum sequentes pontifices aut infringunt, aut omnino tollunt.*—*Nihil enim aliud isti pontificuli cogitabant, quam ut nomen et dignitatem majorum suorum extinguerent*: "The next pope either breaketh or utterly repealeth his predecessors' decrees. For these little petty popes had none other study to busy themselves withal, but only to deface the name and dignity of the former popes¹²."

Where you say, the whole council of Chalcedon so esteemed the voice of pope Leo, as if it had been the voice of Peter himself, this, M. Harding, is a manifest untruth, as it shall soon appear. I grant the name of Leo, for his great learning and gravity, was much regarded. So St. Ambrose [*leg.* St. Athanasius] for the like cause was called *Orbis terrarum oculus, sacerdotum archisacerdos, et fundamentum fidei*: "The eye of the world, the head priest of all priests, and the foundation of the faith¹³." So Paphnutius, being no pope, was heard against all the rest of the council of Nice: so St. Hierom, being neither pope nor bishop, was received against this whole council of Chalcedon.

Neither did the council follow Leo alone, as the universal bishop and head of the church, but joined him together with others, as esteeming them of equal authority. For thus they made their general shout: *Omnes ita credimus: Leo papa ita credit: Cyrillus ita credit: Leo et*

Athanas.
[*leg.* Gregor.
Nazianz.] ad
Heronem.
[i. p. 462.]
Sozom. lib. i.
cap. 33. [ii.
41.]
36. Quæst.
2. Quia [*leg.*
Tria] legi-
tima.

Concil. Chal-
cedon. act. 2.
[vi. 960.]

¹² [The first part of this quotation is from the life of Stephen VI. famous for his persecution of his predecessor's (Formosus) dead body, A.D. 896—897; the latter part from the life of Stephen's successor Romanus, A.D. 897—898.]

¹³ [There is here a remarkable mistake. The author cited in the

margin should be Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. 25. in laudem Heronis, al. Maximi; and the person to whom these titles were given was St. Athanasius, and not St. Ambrose. Jewel probably corrected it, and the printer mistook the correction "Athanasius" for a part of the marginal reference "ad Heronem."]

Anatolius ita credunt : “ Thus we all believe : thus pope Leo believeth : Cyrillus thus believeth : Leo and Anatolius thus believe.”

And with what credit can M. Harding say, the whole council of Chalcedon yielded unto pope Leo, as if it had been unto Peter himself? For it is certain that the same whole council decreed against Leo; and likewise Leo against the council. For the council decreed, contrary to the old canons, that the bishop of Constantinople among the four patriarchs should be the second in dignity, and that the same bishop of Constantinople should have and enjoy one authority and like privileges with the bishop of Rome. The words be these : *Æqua sanctissimæ sedi novæ Romæ privilegia tribuerunt, rationabile judicantes urbem eam ornatam jam imperio et senatu, æquis senioris regiæ Romæ privilegiis frui, et in ecclesiasticis, sicut illa habet, majestatem habere negotiis* : “ The fathers gave equal privileges unto the holy see of new Rome,” which was Constantinople, “ thinking it to be reasonable that the same city of Constantinople, being now furnished with empire and council, should enjoy equal privileges with the princely city of the old Rome, and in all ecclesiastical affairs should bear the same majesty that Rome beareth ¹⁴.” This thing pope Leo much misliked, and found great fault with the council, and would in no wise consent unto it. Thus he writeth : *Quæ per occasionem synodi male sunt attentata, reprehenderam* : “ I reprovèd those things that were evil attempted by the council of Chalcedon.” And again :

Concil. Chalcedon. act. 16. p. 936. [vii. 475]

Leo. epist. 50. [i. 617.]

¹⁴ Concil. Chalced. act. 16. al. act. 15. can. 28. — Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεία καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεία ἀπένευμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἀγνωτάῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες τὴν βασιλεία καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσιν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι

πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν. Routh's Opuscul. vol. ii. 69. Mansi vii. 478. (Conf. Mansi vii. 370 with the note of the Roman editors.) It was in the 16th session that Lucentius *protested* against can. 28, passed in act. 15, on the ground that it was decreed in his absence. That canon has in consequence been always rejected in the Latin church. See the account in Mansi. See also Richard Analys. Concill. vol. i. p. 449.]

Leo. epist.
53. [i. 600.]

Nullum unquam potuerunt [al. *poterunt*] *nostrum obtinere consensum* : "They were never able to get our consent."

And when these matters were past by the consent of all the bishops, Lucentius, pope Leo's legate, came whining in, and besought the council that the whole matter might be repealed. The words written in the council be these:

Concil. Chalcedon, act.
16. [vil. 453.]

Lucentius dixit, Sedes apostolica quæ nobis præcepit, præsentibus humiliari non debet. Et ideo quæcunque in præjudicium canonum hesternæ die gesta sunt, nobis absentibus, sublimitatem vestram petimus, ut circumduci jubeatis. Viri illustrissimi judices dixerunt, Quod interlocuti sumus, tota synodus approbavit : "Lucentius" the pope's legate "said: The apostolic see of Rome, whose commission we have, may not by any these doings be defaced. Therefore we beseech your honours, that whatsoever was concluded here yesterday in our absence, in prejudice of the canons, ye will command the same to be blotted out. The honourable judges made him answer: That we have talked of, the same the whole council hath allowed."

Thus many ways, M. Harding, the untruth of your tale plainly appeareth. For the council of Chalcedon esteemed not the voice of Leo as if it had been the voice of Peter, as you say : but rather contrariwise made light of it, and weighed it none otherwise than they saw cause.

Liberatus,
cap. 13. [p.
93.]

Therefore Liberatus saith thus touching the same : *Cum Anatolius, consentiente concilio, primatum* [i. e. *quædam privilegia*] *obtinuisset, legati vero Romani episcopi contradicerent, a judicibus et episcopis omnibus illa contradictio suscepta non est. Et licet sedes apostolica nunc usque contradicat, tamen, quod a synodo firmatum est, imperatorio patrocínio permanet quodammodo* [al. *quoque modo*] : "When Anatolius" (the bishop of Constantinople) "by consent of the council had obtained the primacy¹⁵, notwithstanding the bishop of Rome's legates stood against it, yet their gainsaying could not be received, neither of the judges nor of the bishops : and albeit the apostolic see of

¹⁵ [The words "primatum obtinuit" are not expressed though implied in the original. It was

not the primacy however, but a primacy equal to that of Rome, that the council consented to.]

Rome withstand it still, yet the decree of the council, by the emperor's warrant, after a sort, continueth in force."

But you never taught us, ye say, that the whole state of the church dependeth of the pope. It is not your doctrine: you never spake it. And therefore we are railers and slanderers that so report you. If it be so indeed, M. Harding, as you say, wherefore then suffer you cardinal Cusanus to write thus? *Veritas adhæret cathedræ. Quare membra cathedræ unita, et pontifici conjuncta, efficiunt ecclesiam*: "The truth cleaveth fast to the" (pope's) "chair." Therefore the members united to the chair, and joined to the pope, make the church." Wherefore suffer you Johannes de Parisiis, one of your catholic doctors, to write thus? *Fiet unum ovile, et unus pastor. Quod quidem de Christo intelligi non potest: sed de aliquo alio ministro, qui præsit loco ejus*: "There shall be one flock, and one shepherd. Which thing cannot be taken of Christ: we must needs understand it of some other minister that ruleth in his stead."

Nicolaus Cusanus ad Bohemos, epist. 2. [p. 833.]

Johan. de Paris, de Potestate Regia et Papali, cap. 3. [p. 111.]

Wherefore suffer you Hosius your grand captain to write thus? *Unum toti præesse ecclesiæ usque adeo est necessarium, ut absque hoc, ecclesia una esse non possit*: "It is so necessary a thing that one only man overrule the whole church, that without the same the church cannot be one." Wherefore suffer you your canonists to say: *Constat ecclesiam ideo esse unam, quia in universali ecclesia unum est caput supremum, scilicet papa*: "It is plain, that therefore the church is one, because that in the whole universal church there is one supreme head, that is, the pope?"

Hosius In Confessione Petricov. cap. 26. [fol. 19. col. 1.]

Clemen. lib. 5. Ad nostrum: in Glossa. [lit. r.]

To be short, why do you yourself, M. Harding, allege St. Hierom's words directly, as ye would have us believe, to this purpose? *Ecclesiæ salus a summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet*: which words into English ye have turned thus: "The safety of the church hangeth of the worship of the high priest. He meaneth the pope, Peter's successor." In which last clause, ye misconstrue and rack St. Hierom's words far contrary to his meaning. For St. Hierom meant not hereby the bishop of Rome, but every several bishop within his own charge: every which

M. Harding, [Answer to Chall.] fol. 80. b.

Hierom. contra Luciferianos. [lv. pt. 2. p. 295.]

Art. 4. Div.
15. [supra
vol. ii. p.
193.]

bishop he calleth the highest priest, as in my former Reply it is declared more at large.

If these things be true, why are they now denied? if they be false, why are they not condemned? I trust it may appear by these few, that we report the truth truly, and are no slanderers.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. Divis. 2.

Sithence then they bring forth none of these for themselves, and call us nevertheless heretics, which have neither fallen from Christ, nor from the apostles, nor yet from the prophets, this is an injurious, and a very spiteful dealing.

[Vol. iv. p.
13.]

M. HARDING.

Nay, sirs, ye shall not so carry away the conclusion with a lie. But contrariwise, sithence we bring forth many scriptures for the truth, which ye impugn, as yourselves shall see when we come to confute your doctrine, which here followeth: and sithence notwithstanding that ye will not yield to the scriptures, but pervert the true meaning of them with glosses and interpretations of your own heads, frame new opinions contrary to that ye have received, and that the church hath ever taught; the catholics will still call you heretics, and the church will condemn you for heretics, and so account you until ye recant and repent.

Untruth.

But ye have not fallen from Christ, ye say, nor from the apostles, nor yet from the prophets. As though they that depart from the Roman church, which is the catholic church, which divers times in the Apology ye confess, fell not from Christ, and consequently from the apostles and prophets. Saith not Christ in the Gospel, "He that heareth not the church, let him be to thee as an heathen and a publican?" Saith he not also, "He that despiseth you despiseth me?"

That the de-
fenders be
fallen from
Christ.

Matt. xviii.
17.
Luke x. 16.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Whether part rightly and reverently useth the scriptures of God, and whether perverteth them by shifts and glosses, I trust it shall in part appear by this conference. Indeed, M. Harding, it is no great mastery by your interpretations and handlings, to have store enough and plenty of scriptures. For this is one special ground of your divinity: *Papa potest ex nihilo* [i. nullo] *facere aliquid*:

Extra de
Tranelat.
Episc. Quan-
to in Gloss.

.....*et sententiam quæ nulla est, facere aliquam*: "The pope is able of nothing to make something: and of no sentence to make some sentence." By your doctrine it is lawful and good logic to reason thus: *An gloriabitur serra adversus eum qui trahit illam?* "Shall the saw boast against him that draweth it?" *Non est servus supra dominum*: "There is no servant above his lord:" *ergo*, no man may dare to judge the pope¹⁶. Or thus: *Omnia munda mundis: coinquinatis autem et infidelibus nihil est mundum*: "All things are clean to the clean: but unto the filthy and infidels nothing is clean:" *ergo*, it is not lawful for priests to marry.

Dist. 21. Inferior sedes. Isa. x. 15.

Matt. x. 24. Concil. Roman. sub. Sylvestro 1. [ii. 615.]

Ad tit. 1. dist. 82. pro posuisti.

Or as you, M. Harding, sometimes have delighted to reason: *Nolite dare sanctum canibus*: "Give not holy things to dogs:" *ergo*, it is not lawful for the Christian vulgar people to read the scriptures.

Matt. vii. 6. M. Harding in his former book, fol. 155 b.

Thus may you easily be well stored and full freight of scriptures enow, and, as St. Hierom saith, may carry them captive to serve your turn. But St. Hierom could also have told you: *Non in verbis scripturarum est evangelium, sed in sensu*: "The gospel standeth not in the bare words of the scriptures, but in the meaning:" therefore we may say unto you, as St. Cyprian once said to the Novatian heretics: *Audite Novatiani, apud quos scripture cælestes leguntur potius quam intelliguntur*: "Hearken hereto ye Novatian heretics, amongst whom the heavenly scriptures are read rather than well perceived¹⁷."

Hieronym. ad Pammachium. [iv. pt. 2. p. 236.] Exempla captiva serviunt ad victoriam.

Hieronym. in 1. cap. ad Galat. [iv. pt. 1. p. 230.] Cyprian. ad Novatian. tom. 1. [app. ix.]

You say, the church of Rome by your own confession is the catholic church: which church, forasmuch as we have forsaken, we have forsaken Christ and his apostles. For saith not Christ in the Gospel, say you: "He that heareth not the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen and a publican?" and, "He that despiseth you despiseth me?"

Matt. xviii. 17.

Luke x. 16.

We grant, M. Harding, the name of the church of Rome is catholic: but the errors and abuses thereof are

¹⁶ [Richard Anal. Concill. says that the Acta Concil. Roman. sub Sylvestro are spurious, vol. i. p. 234.]

¹⁷ [Cyprian. ad Novat. The genuineness of this word is doubted by some.]

not catholic. Neither is it the church that we find fault withal: but the great corruptions and foul deformities that you have brought into the church.

Howbeit, your policy herein is apparent. Your reader, be he never so simple, may soon see your whole drift. Ye magnify the church with all manner titles of authority, not for any special regard ye bear the church indeed, but only to settle yourselves in an infinite tyranny, and to make us believe that you only are the church, and to give credit to all your phantasies: yea although ye be the defacers and enemies of the church. Verily the bare name of the church is not sufficient. St. Paul saith that Antichrist the man of sin shall sit in the temple of God: whereby no doubt he meant the church.

But, M. Harding, hear you the voice of God: leave your fables: speak God's holy word, and speak it truly: be ye faithful ministers of the truth. Then whosoever shall be found to despise your doctrine, be he king or emperor, we will not doubt to call him an heathen and publican. But if he be an heathen that will not hear your church, what is he then that will not hear Christ? Æneas Sylvius, being afterward pope himself, saith thus: *Si Romanus pontifex non audiet ecclesiam, Christum quoque non audiet, et tanquam ethnicus et publicanus haberi debet*: "If the bishop of Rome will not hear the church, he will not hear Christ, and therefore must be taken as an heathen and publican." St. Augustine saith: *Oves mee vocem meam audiunt, et sequuntur me.....Auferantur chartæ humanæ: sonent voces divinæ*: "My sheep hear my voice and follow me. Away with man's writings: let the voice of God sound unto us¹⁸."

Surely doctor Luther himself, against whom M. Harding so vehemently and so often inflameth his choler, in humble and reverent manner writeth thus: *Nos colimus Romanam ecclesiam in omnibus. Tantum illis resistimus qui pro ecclesia obtrudunt Babyloniam*: "We honour the church of Rome in all things. Only we withstand them that instead

2 Thess. II. 4.

Æneas Sylvius de Gestis Concilii Basiliensis. [p. 11. c.]
Paulus Ursperg. p. 411.
[Paralip. ad ann. 1458.]

Augustin. de ovibus. [leg. de pastoribus, tom. v. 242.]

Paul. Ursperg. [Paralip.] p. 472.
[ad ann. 1529.]

¹⁸ [The homily "de ovibus," upon the thirty-fourth chapter of and that "de pastoribus," are both Ezekiel.]

of the church have thrust in the confusion of Babylon.”

In like sense St. Cyprian saith: *Non est pax, sed bellum*: Cyprian. serm. 5. De Lapsis. [p. 186.]
nec ecclesiæ jungitur qui ab evangelio separatur: “It is not peace, it is war: neither is he joined to the church that is divided from the gospel.” Now, how carefully the church of Rome is led by the gospel of Christ, we may easily learn by Nicolaus Cusanus, a cardinal of the same church of Rome. Thus he saith: *Sequuntur scripturæ ecclesiam: et non e converso*: Nicol. Cusanus ad Bonifacium, epist. 7. [p. 858.] “The scriptures of God follow the church: but contrariwise the church followeth not the scriptures.” To conclude, we may say unto you as St. Augustine said sometime to Petilian the Donatian heretic: *Utrum nos schismatici sumus, an vos, nec ego, nec tu, sed Christus interrogetur, ut indicet ecclesiam suam*: Augustin. contra Litteras Petilian, lib. 2. cap. 85. [ix. 271.] “Whether of us be schismatics, we or you, ask you not me: I will not ask you: let Christ be asked, that he may shew us his own church.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. Divis. 1.

With this sword did Christ put off the devil when he was tempted of him: with these weapons ought all presumption, which doth advance itself against God, to be overthrown and conquered. For all 2 Tim. iii. 16. scripture, saith St. Paul, that cometh by the inspiration of God, is profitable to teach, to confute, to instruct, and to reprove, that the man of God may be perfect, and throughly framed to every good work. Thus did the holy fathers alway fight against the heretics, with none other force than with the holy scriptures.

M. HARDING.

That the holy fathers did evermore fight against the heretics with none other force than with the holy scriptures, that we deny.

For what did the fathers in the first general council holden at Nice? Did they fight against Arius, and the maintainers of his heresy, with no other force than with the scriptures? When those heretics refused the word *homousion*, whereby it is signified the

Son of God to be of one and the same substance with God the Father, for that it was not to be found in the scriptures, besides which they stiffly denied, as ye do, that any thing ought to be received: did not the catholic bishops of the other side fly to the ancient fathers? Did they not appeal to the judgments of those fathers which had given sentence of the matter then being in controversy, before that Arius and those that held of his side were born?

In the second council assembled at Constantinople, were not the heretics of sundry sects, by a witty and a godly policy contrived between Nectarius the bishop and Theodosius the emperor, through the suggestion of the great clerk Sisinnius, driven to receive the doctors, who lived before their heresies were heard of, as witnesses of true Christian doctrine, worthy of credit?

Histor. Tripart. lib. 5. cap. 10.

Macedonius in that council was condemned, who therefore denied the Holy Ghost to be God, because the scriptures give not unto him that name. But the bishops there assembled, as Photius that learned bishop writeth, declared out of the teaching of the fathers and divines before their time, that the Holy Ghost is to be adored, worshipped, and glorified, as being of one nature and substance together with the Father and the Son.

Macedonius.

In the third council kept at Ephesus, the heretic Nestorius boasted, as ye do, of the scriptures, saying they were of his side, and would neither speak nor hear ought but scriptures, scriptures. And alleging a place or two out of the Gospel, where Mary is called the mother of Jesus, stoutly, "Find me in all scripture," quoth he, "where Mary is called the mother of God." Hereto what said that holy and learned bishop Cyrillus, chief in that council? *Hanc nobis fidem divini tradidere discipuli: et licet nullam fecerint dictionis hujus mentionem, ita tamen sentire a sanctis patribus edocti sumus*: "This faith," saith he, "the disciples of God have by tradition left unto us. And although they have made no express mention of this word *Deipara*, yet so

Nestorius ever called for scriptures, as the heretics at this day do, whatsoever sect they be of.

Epist. 1. tom. 4. [Cyril. ed. Basll. col. 2.]

When they reasoned about rules touching faith to be made, (saith Vincentius Lirinensis writing of that council) to all the bishops there assembled, to the number almost of two hundred, this seemed most catholic, most faithful, and best to be done, that the sentences of the holy fathers should be brought forth among them: to the end that by their consent and decree the religion of the old doctrine should be confirmed, and the blasphemy of the profane novelty condemned. Behold, sirs, what weapons the fathers have used against heresies, besides the holy scriptures.

Deipara not found in scripture, yet received and kept.

In the fourth council, which was celebrated at Chalcedon, the heretic Eutyches, as ye and all heretics have done, craked much of the scriptures, and required his matter to be discussed by scriptures, "Tell me," (quoth he mockingly to every one that reasoned with him,) "in what scripture lie the two natures?"

Eutyches claimed his opinion to be tried by the scriptures.

The teaching
of the fathers
to be kept.

Act. 5. [vil.
116.]

But let us hear what the learned bishops of that council said thereto. We find in the first action of the council, that they cried out aloud, *Ea quæ sunt patrum, teneantur*: "The things that the fathers have taught, let them be kept." Again, when they come to the definitive sentence, they say: *Sequentes igitur sanctos patres*, &c.: "Following the holy fathers, we do all with one accord teach men to confess one and himself the Son our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect himself in Godhead, and perfect himself in manhood." And for authority of the fathers in high points of faith, a bishop in that reverend assembly named Eudoxius pronounced a notable sentence, saying thus: "Every one that consenteth not to the exposition of the holy fathers, doth alienate himself from all priestly communion, and from the presence of Christ." Thus we have alleged the four first general councils, which St. Gregory honoureth as the four Gospels.

A notable
saying of a
learned fa-
ther, for the
exposition of
the fathers.

But the thing being so evident as it is, and so well known even to yourselves, if ye be learned, the authority of these chief councils may suffice.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye have taken in hand a needless labour. For you know right well, we despise not the authority of the holy fathers, but rather in this selfsame place have alleged together St. Augustine, St. Hierom, and St. Ambrose, three of the most ancient and approved fathers: and throughout the whole discourse of this Apology, in the defence of the catholic truth of our religion, next unto God's holy word, have used no proof or authority so much as the expositions and judgments of the holy fathers. We despise them not therefore, but rather give God thanks in their behalf, for that it hath pleased him to provide so worthy instruments for his church: and therefore we justly reprove you, for that so unadvisedly and without cause ye have forsaken the steps of so holy fathers.

These four general councils wherein you dwell so long, as they make nothing against us, so in sundry points they fight expressly against you.

First, they were summoned by the emperors Constantinus, Theodosius I. Theodosius II. and Martianus: and not by any right or authority of the pope: as hereafter it shall be shewed in place convenient more at large.

a Sozom. lib.
i. cap. 16.
[ii. 34.]

b Concil.
Chalcedon.
act. i. fol.
748. [vi. 613.]

Eodem te-
nore . . . Leo
vocatus est.

c Euseb. de
Vita Con-
stan. or. 3.
[i. 580.]

d Concil. Ni-
cen. can. 6.
[ii. 669.]

e Concil.
Chalcedon.
act. 16. p.
936. [vii.
428.]

f Liberat.
cap. 13. [p.
93.]

^a Julius¹⁹ the bishop of Rome was summoned by the emperor's writ to appear at the council of Nice, as well as others. ^b And pope Leo afterward was charged by like authority to appear at the council of Chalcedon.

^c In the council of Nice the bishop of Rome was not president, but Eustathius the bishop of Antioch. In the same ^d council of Nice²⁰, the bishop of Rome hath his authority and jurisdiction made equal and level with the other three patriarchs. ^e And in the council of Chalcedon the bishop of Constantinople is made equal in authority with the bishop of Rome. To be short ^f the said council of Chalcedon, for this last and some other like causes, Leo the bishop of Rome would not allow. Which thing notwithstanding, the council standeth still in force, whether the pope will or no.

These be the four first general councils, which M. Harding compareth in authority with the four Evangelists.

"But these heretics, Arius, Nestorius, Macedonius, and Eutyches in these four general councils utterly despised all the ancient fathers, and boasted themselves," saith M. Harding, "of the scriptures, and evermore cried out, 'Scriptures, scriptures.'" Touching the Arians, that they alleged certain doubtful and dark places of the scriptures to serve their purpose, it is certain and manifest. But that either they despised, or that the catholics against them avouched, the exposition and authority of any father, M. Harding's only word must be our warrant. For neither allegeth he any one author for proof hereof, nor yet nameth any of all these fathers.

Notwithstanding, let us grant these heretics cried out, as M. Harding saith, "Scriptures, scriptures." Even so did the same heretics likewise cry out, even as now M. Hard-

¹⁹ [Julius. This, as shewn by Valesius and Reading, is an error of Sozomenus substituting the name of Julius instead of that of Sylvester his predecessor, who sat for eleven or twelve years after the council of Nice. Many writers

have been misled by Sozomenus.]

²⁰ [Paschasius alleged that the canon 6. Concil. Nic. began thus, "Ecclesia Romana semper primum obtinuit," which turned out to be a gross forgery. See Richard Analys. Concill. i. 243.]

ing doth, "Fathers, fathers." Socrates saith: *Et Ariani Origenis libros citabant in testimonium, ut illi quidem judicabant, sui dogmatis*: "And the Arian heretics alleged the learned father Origen's books, as they thought, for proof and witness of their doctrine." Socrat. lib. 4. cap. 21. [cap. 26. tom. II. 246.] ὡς φοντο.

The heretic Eutyches said: *Ego legi scripta beati Cypriani*²¹ [l. *Cyrilli*], *et sanctorum patrum, et sancti Athanasii*: "I have read the writings of St. Cyprian, and of other holy fathers, and of St. Athanasius." Concil. Chalcedon. act. 1. p. 792. [vi. pp. 745. 809.]

Likewise the Eutychian heretic Carosus said: *Ego secundum expositionem trecentorum octodecim patrum sic credo, sic baptizatus sum. Aliud quid mihi dicas, nescio*: "This is my faith, according to the exposition of the three hundred and eighteen fathers," (in the council of Nice) "in this faith was I baptized. What ye should say more to me, I cannot tell." Concil. Chalcedon. act. 4. p. 877. [vii. 73. 76.]

Even so said Eutyches himself: *Sic a progenitoribus meis accepi, et credidi. In hac fide baptizatus sum, et signatus: et usque ad hunc diem in ea vixi, et in ea opto mori*: "Thus have I received of my forefathers, and thus have I believed. In this faith was I baptized and signed, and in the same have I lived until this day, and in the same I wish to die." Thus St. Augustine saith the Doctrian heretic Cresconius alleged the authority of St. Cyprian. Thus the Nestorian heretics alleged the authority of the council of Nice. Concil. Chalcedon. act. 1. p. 751. [vi. 632.] Augustin. contra Cres. lib. 4. cap. 17. [ix. 494.] Concil. tom. 1. p. 568.

To be short, thus the heretic Dioscorus cried out in the open council of Chalcedon: *Ego habeo testimonia sanctorum patrum, Athanasii, Gregorii, Cyrilli: non transgredior in aliquo: ego cum patribus ejicior: ego defendo patrum dogmata. Ego horum habeo testimonia, non simpliciter aut transitorie, sed in ipsorum libris*: "I have the testimonies of the holy fathers, Athanasius, Gregorius, Cyrillus: I alter not from them in any point: I am thrown forth and banished with the fathers: I defend the fathers' Concil. Chalcedon. act. 1. p. 767. [vi. 684.]

²¹ [See supra, vol. ii. 417, (with note ⁹), where Jewel has also by an oversight named St. Cyprian instead of St. Cyril. In p. 441. Def. Ap. ed. 1609, the name is quoted correctly.]

doctrine: I have their judgment uttered, not by chance or unadvisedly, but remaining expressed in their books."

I doubt not, M. Harding, but you may hereby easily see, that the heretics ye speak of cried not only "Scriptures, scriptures," as ye say, but had leisure also sometimes to cry, as ye do, "Fathers, fathers:" and that as well to purpose and as rightly as you of long time have used to cry, having indeed in the cases we speak of neither scriptures nor fathers.

To come near the matter, we say not that all cases of doubt are by manifest and open words plainly expressed in the scriptures. For so there should need no exposition. But we say, there is no case in religion so dark and doubtful, but it may necessarily be either proved or reproved, by collection and conference of the scriptures.

Hieronym.
[lib. 5.] in
Isa. cap. 19.
[iii. 127.]

St. Hierom saith: *Moris est scripturarum obscuris manifesta subnectere*: "It is the order of the scriptures, after hard things to join other things that be plain." St. Au-

Augustin, in
lib. 83.
Quest. q. 69.
p. 325. [vl.
56.]

gustine likewise saith: *Solet circumstantia scripturarum illuminare sententiam*: "The circumstance of the scriptures is wont to give light and to open the meaning."

Tertull. adv.
Praxeam.
[cap. 20. p.
511.]

The like rule Tertullian also giveth: *Oportet secundum plura intelligi pauciora*: "The fewer places must be expounded by the more." Therefore touching this word *homousius*, which M. Harding here moveth, and the whole

Epiphan. lib.
3. de Semi-
arianis.
δ δὲ νόϋς
πανταχοῦ.
[l. 859.]

contention of the Arians, Epiphanius writeth thus: *Nomen substantiæ simpliciter et nude in veteri et nova scriptura non proponitur, sententia autem ejus nominis ubique occurrit*: "This word (substance) plainly and nakedly is not found, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament, but the sense and meaning of that word is found every where."

In this conference and judgment of the holy scriptures we need oftentimes the discretion and wisdom of learned fathers. Yet notwithstanding may we not give them herein greater credit than is convenient, or than they themselves, if it were offered, would receive. We may reverently say of them as Seneca in the like case sometime said: *Non sunt domini, sed duces nostri*: "They are our leaders, but not

Seneca.

our lords." They are not the truth of God itself, but only witnesses unto the truth.

Therefore St. Augustine saith : *Alios (scriptores) ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem quod ipsi ita senserint, sed quod (id) mihi, vel per alios [leg. illos] authores canonicos, vel probabili ratione persuadere potuerint* : "Other writers or fathers" (besides the holy scriptures) "I read in this sort, that, be their learning or holiness never so great, I will not think it true, because they have thought so, but because they are able to persuade me so, either by other canonical writers, or else by some likely reason." Likewise again he saith : *Hoc genus literarum non cum credendi necessitate, sed cum judicandi libertate legendum est* : "This kind of writings" (of the holy doctors and fathers) "must be read, not with necessity to believe each thing, but with liberty to judge each thing." And to that end he saith : *Ne catholicis quidem episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte falluntur, ut contra canonicas Dei scripturas sentiant* : "We may not consent unto the bishops, notwithstanding they be catholic, if they judge contrary to the holy canonical scriptures." In this authority and credit we have and ought to have the holy fathers.

Now let us see whether the bishops and others in these councils confuted these heretics, as we say, by the scriptures, or else, as M. Harding seemeth to say, for want or weakness of the scriptures used therein the authority of the fathers. First, the emperor Constantinus in the council of Nice, instructing the bishops there how they might best debate their quarrels and end all strifes, saith thus unto them : *Evangelicæ et apostolicæ literæ, et veterum prophetarum oracula perspicue nos instituunt quid oporteat sapere de voluntate et sensu Dei. Ponentes ergo contentionem, ex divinitus inspiratis oraculis quæramus solutionem eorum quæ proponuntur* : "The evangelists' and apostles' writings, and the sayings of the old prophets, do clearly instruct us, what judgment we ought to have of the meaning and will of God. Therefore laying aside all conten-

Augustin.
epist. 19. ad
Hieronym.
[ii. 190.]

Augustin.
contra Faust.
lib. 11. cap.
5. [viii. 220.]

Augustin. de
Unit. Ec-
cles. cap. 10.
[ix. 355.]

Theod. lib. 1.
cap. 7. [iii.
26, 27.]

Trip. Hist.
lib. 2. cap. 5.
σαφῶς ἡμᾶς
ἂν χρῆ περὶ
τοῦ θεοῦ
φρονεῖν ἐκ-
παιδεύουσι.

tion, out of those heavenly oracles let us seek for the assoiling of our questions."

Socrates :
καὶ ἀνα-
πτύσαντες
τὰς θείας
γραφὰς πολ-
λάκις ἀνε-
τρέψαμεν
αὐτούς.

Augustin.
contra Max-
im. lib. 3.
cap. 14. [viii.
704.]

Socrates also, touching the same council of Nice, saith thus of the Arian heretics : *Explicantes sacrosanctas scripturas, sæpe illos evertimus* : " By opening and expounding the holy scriptures, oftentimes we overthrew them."

Likewise St. Augustine, disputing against the same Arians, refuseth, as I have said before, both councils and fathers, and appealeth only to the scriptures : *Nec ego Nice-nam synodum tibi, nec tu mihi Ariminensem debes objicere : scripturarum autoritatibus,.....res cum re, causa cum causa, ratio cum ratione concertet* : " Neither will I allege the council of Nice against you, nor shall you allege the council of Ariminum against me. By the authority of the scriptures let us weigh matter with matter, cause with cause, reason with reason."

Athan. ad
Serapion.
Spirit. Sanct.
non esse cre-
aturam, p.
676. [i. pt. 2.
667.]

Touching the council holden at Constantinople against Macedonius, and the divinity of the Holy Ghost, Athanasius saith : *Ne interrogas, sed solum ex sacris literis con-discas. Sufficiunt enim documenta quæ in illis reperias* : " Never move question hereof, but only learn of the holy scriptures. For the only proofs that ye shall there find are sufficient" (to warrant the Godhead of the Holy Ghost). So likewise saith Evagrius of the other two councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon : *Ex evangelicis et apostolicis de Domino vocibus scimus viros illos divinos constituisse* : " We know that these godly fathers concluded this matter by such words as the evangelists and apostles have uttered of our Lord."

Evagrius.

Origen. in
cap. 16. ad
Rom. lib. 10.
[iv. 684.]

Therefore the ancient father Origen saith : *Vide quam prope periculis illi sint [leg. fiant] qui negligunt exerceri in divinis literis : ex quibus solis examinationis hujusmodi agnoscenda discretio est* : " Consider in what danger they be that have no care to read the holy scriptures. For by the same scriptures only the judgment of this trial must be allowed." Even so saith Chrysostom : *Etiam si in ipsis veris ecclesiis, quæ Dei sunt, dixerint Christum apparuisse, nolite eis credere dicentibus ista de*

Chrysost.
in Opere Im-
perfecto.
hom. 49. [vi.
app. 209.]

me : non enim digna est divinitatis meæ hæc notitia. Ostendens per hæc quod ab ipsis sæpe veris Ecclesiis exeunt seductores. Propterea ne ipsis quidem credendum est, nisi ea vel dicant vel faciant quæ convenientia sint scripturis :

“Yea if they say that Christ hath appeared in the very true churches of God, yet believe them not : for this is no worthy or sufficient knowledge of my Godhead. By this he sheweth, that out of the very true churches oftentimes come forth deceivers. Therefore we may not believe, no not them” (that speak unto us in the name of the church), “unless they speak and do such things as are agreeable to the scriptures.” In like manner again saith Origen :

Necesse nobis est in testimonium vocare sanctas scripturas. Sensus quippe nostri et enarrationes sine iis testibus non habent fidem : “We must needs call to witness the holy scriptures. For our judgments and expositions without those witnesses carry no credit.”

And, to leave all other like authorities that might be alleged, for short conclusion, St. Augustine saith : *Solis* Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 61. [x. 158.] *canonicis scripturis sine ulla recusatione consensum debeo :* “I owe my consent without gainsaying” (not unto the doctors or fathers, but) “only unto the canonical scriptures.”

But the bishops in those councils, saith M. Harding, brought forth and followed the expositions of the ancient learned fathers. And wherefore might they not? what man ever taught or said the contrary? Yet notwithstanding they alleged them, not as the foundations, or grounds, but only as approved and faithful witnesses of the truth. Which thing, if M. Harding haply will deny, may easily appear by the words of Cyrillus, pronounced and published openly in the council of Chalcedon : *Gratulamur* Evagrius, lib. 2. cap. 18. [320, 321.] *nobis mutuo, quod et nostræ et vestræ ecclesiæ fidem habent* ταῖς θεοπνεύστοις *consentientem, et divinitus adspiratis scripturis, et tradi-* γραφαῖς. *onibus sanctorum patrum :* “We rejoyce together, each of us in other’s behalf, for that the faith both of our churches and also of yours, is agreeable both unto the heavenly inspired scriptures, and also to the tradition and exposition of our fathers.” Which words of Cyrillus being heard,

Concil. Chalcedon, act. 2.
[vi. 960.]

and the consent of the fathers being known, the whole council for joy made a shout together : *Omnes ita credimus : papa Leo ita credit*, &c. : “ Thus we all believe : pope Leo thus believeth : thus believeth Leo and Anatolius : thus Cyrillus believeth : this is the faith of our fathers : this is the faith of the apostles : thus have the apostles taught.”

Thus may you see, M. Harding, (we say not to you, as you do to us, “ if you be learned,” for thereof we have no doubt : God grant you may direct your learning to his glory,) but thus may you see, to what end the bishops in the councils ye speak of alleged the expositions of the ancient fathers, and how far they weighed them under the authority of the scriptures. In like sort do we also this day allege against you the manifest, and undoubted, and agreeable judgments of the most ancient learned holy fathers : and thereby, as by approved and faithful witnesses, we disclose the infinite follies and errors of your doctrine. And seeing you have forsaken the fellowship of the said holy fathers, as hereafter shall more fully appear, we say unto you as Eudoxius said unto the heretic abbot Eutyches in the council of Chalcedon : “ Ye have removed yourselves both from all priestly communion, and also from the presence of Christ.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. *Divis. 2.*

De Unitate
Eccles. cap.
3. [ix. 340.]
et contra
Maximum
Arian. Epis.
lib. 3. cap. 14.
[viii. 704.]

St. Augustine, when he disputed against Petilian ^[Vol. iv. p. 13.] the Donatian heretic : “ Let not these words,” quod²⁰ he, “ be heard between us : ‘ I say,’ or ‘ you say :’ let us rather speak in this wise : ‘ Thus saith the Lord.’ There let us seek the church, there let us bolt out the cause²¹.”

M. HARDING.

Concerning this place of St. Augustine, it ought not to be stretched to all matters in general that be in question, as though we might not use the testimonies and authorities of the fathers against heretics : but it pertaineth only to the question in that

²⁰ [“ Quod” (præterperf.); so it should be printed here ; not (as in the ed. of 1609) “ quoth.” See

Jamieson’s Dictionary.]

²¹ [To bolt out—to examine by sifting.]

book *De Unitate Ecclesiæ* treated of, which is, where the church is. Petilian the Donatist, and the maintainers of that heresy, contended the church to be only in Africa, or at the furthest, *in parte Donati*, among them only that held with Donatus. The same heresy went they about to prove by scriptures: but when St. Augustine saw how weak their proofs were, which they brought out of the scriptures, he provoked them, the better to overthrow them, to come to the trial of the scriptures. And indeed where the scriptures be manifest for proof of any matter, what need is there of doctors? But where the sense of the scriptures is obscure, and may be wrested by evil wits to the maintenance of an heresy, there the expositions of the fathers by all old writers have been taken of necessity to supply the scriptures' obscurity, and to declare the sense of the church, which the Holy Ghost hath prompted. And in such cases St. Augustine himself useth the testimonies of the fathers not seldom, namely against Julian the Pelagian: where beside scripture, touching original sin, he allegeth against the Pelagians a great number of fathers, and at length in one place, speaking of the authority, reverence, and credit he had them in, he saith thus: *Quod credunt [censent], credo [censeo], &c.*: "What they believe, I believe: what they hold, I hold: what they teach, I teach: what they preach, I preach." From the special to the general negatively the argument holdeth not, ye know, if ye have not forgotten your logic.

Manifest untruth.

Contra Julianum Pelagian. lib. 1. [x. 519.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

M. Harding, as well here as elsewhere, thinketh it an easy matter with a bold asseveration to smooth his unlearned simple reader, especially such a one as hath no eyes to look after him. These words of St. Augustine, saith he, pertain only unto the matter he had then in hand, and therefore may not be forced to any other. And here he remembereth us of a profound point in logic, that a negative conclusion from the special to the general cannot hold. Here it were a matter worthy the hearing: first, how M. Harding could enter so deeply to know so much of St. Augustine's meaning: next, forasmuch as in respect of himself, he evermore fancieth us to be unlearned, how he were able to teach us to know the same. He assureth us upon his word, that these words of St. Augustine must needs be expounded and restrained to that only matter, and may not in any wise be stretched farther: and this, he imagineth, was St. Augustine's meaning. Thus, good reader, by M. Harding's handling, thou hast here a meaning

of St. Augustine's that St. Augustine himself never meant. For St. Augustine in the same matter, and against the same heretic Petilian, although not in the same book, writeth thus : *Sive de Christo, sive de ejus ecclesia, sive de quacunque re alia quæ pertinet ad fidem, vitamque nostram, non dicam, Si nos, sed, Si angelus de cælo nobis annuntiaverit, præterquam quod in scripturis legalibus, et evangelicis accepistis, anathema sit* : "Whether it be of Christ, or of his church, or of any thing else whatsoever, pertaining either to our life or to our faith, I will not say, If I myself, but If an angel from heaven shall teach us otherwise than we have received in the books of the law and in the gospels, hold him accursed."

Augustin.
contra Liter.
Petilian. lib.
3. cap. 6. [ix.
301.]

Galat. i.

De quacun-
que re.

M. Harding saith, St. Augustine meant only of one matter : St. Augustine himself saith, he meant of all manner matters, touching either faith or life.

M. Harding saith, St. Augustine meant this only of himself : St. Augustine himself saith, he meant it of any other, yea even of the angels of God. And shall we think M. Harding knoweth St. Augustine's meaning, and St. Augustine himself knew it not ?

Si angelus
de cælo.

Verily St. Augustine in another case concerning the Arians, as I have touched twice before, likewise refuseth the determinations of all councils and fathers, and standeth only to the scriptures : neither will I, saith he, allege against thee the council of Nice, nor shalt thou allege against me the council of Ariminum, &c.

Augustin.
contra Max-
iminum, lib.
3. cap. 14.
[viii. 704.]

Neither doth St. Augustine only say thus, but also yieldeth a reason why he saith it. These be his words : *Auferantur de medio, quæ adversus nos invicem, non ex divinis canonicis libris, sed aliunde recitamus.....Quæret fortasse aliquis, Cur vis ista auferri de medio?.....Quia nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis ecclesiam sanctam demonstrari* : "Have away all those authorities that either of us allegeth against the other, saving such only as be taken out of the heavenly canonical scriptures. But perhaps some man will ask me, Wherefore would ye have all such other authorities put away? I answer, Because I would have the holy church to be proved, not by the doctrines of men, but by the word of God."

Augustin. de
Unitate con-
tra Petilian.
cap. 3. [ix.
341.]

So saith St. Augustine unto other the Donatists: *Auf-* Augustin. in Psal. lvi. [iv. 541.]

rantur de medio chartæ nostræ: procedat in medium codex Dei. Audi Christum dicentem: audi veritatem loquentem:

“Take away from amongst us any our own books: let the book of God come amongst us. Hear, what Christ saith: hearken, what the truth speaketh.” Again he saith: *Audi,* Augustin. in Epist. 48. [ii. 239.]

Dicit Dominus: non, Dicit Donatus, aut Rogatus, aut Vincentius, aut Hilarius, aut Ambrosius, aut Augustinus: sed, Dicit Dominus: “Hear this, The Lord saith: hear not this, Donatus saith, Rogatus saith, Vincentius saith, Hilarius saith, Ambrose saith, Augustine saith: but hearken to this, The Lord saith.”

In like form of words saith St. Ambrose: *Nolo nobis credatur: scriptura recitetur. Non ego dico a me, In principio erat verbum, sed audio. Non ego effingo, sed lego:* Ambros. de Incarnat. Dom. Sacram. cap. 3. [ii. 706.]

“I would not ye should believe us, but read the scriptures. I say not of myself, In the beginning was the word, but I hear it. I make it not, but I read it.”

Likewise saith Chrysostom²²: *Oro vos omnes ut relin-* Chrysost. in 2. ad Cor. hom. 3.
quatis quid huic, aut illi videatur, et de his a scripturis hæc omnia inquire: “I beseech you all, weigh not what this man or that man thinketh: but touching all these things, search the scriptures.”

Now, whereas it pleaseth M. Harding to tell us of an argument negative from special to general, and so to call us to the remembrance of our logic: pleaseth it him also to remember that the argument that we ground of St. Augustine’s words holdeth not, as it is here imagined, from special to general: but from the imperfection and weakness of the wisdom of man, to the stability and certainty of God’s holy word. And therefore the old learned father

Origen saith, as it is alleged before: *Sensus nostri et enar-* Origen. in Jerem. hom. 1. [iii. 129.]
rationes sine his testibus non habent fidem: “Our judgments and expositions without these witnesses” (of the scriptures)

“have no credit.” In like sort St. Hierom: *Quamvis* Hieron. in Psal. lxxxvi. [ii. pt. 2. 350.]
sanctus sit aliquis post apostolos, quamvis disertus sit, non habet auctoritatem: “After the apostles of Christ, not-

²² [Chrysostom. There is some mistake in the marginal reference.]

withstanding some man be holy, notwithstanding he be eloquent, yet he wanteth authority." Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Cedamus et consentiamus scripturæ sacræ, quæ nec falli potest, nec fallere*: "Let us yield and consent to the holy scripture, which can neither deceive nor be deceived." For this cause, M. Harding, St. Augustine not only in the matter that lay between him and Petilianus, but also in all other matters whatsoever, so often appealed from all fathers and councils unto the scriptures.

Augustin. de
Peccator.
Merit. et Re-
mis. lib. 1.
cap. 22. [x.
19.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. Divis. 3.

Likewise St. Hierom: "All those things," saith he, "which without the testimony of the scriptures are holden as delivered from the apostles, be thoroughly sinitten down by the sword of God's word²³."

[Hieronym.
in 1. Aggæ.
tom. iii.
1690.]

[Vol. iv. p.
14.]

M. HARDING.

Ye would fain remove us from a good hold, I see well, which is the authority of the holy fathers, of ancient traditions, and of the universal church. All these would ye to be of no force against heretics. For ye know the fathers and the church to be against you, and that, so long as they are believed, your doctrine shall not be received, as always found to be new and of private device. If we were driven from these, ye doubt not but to match us well enough in the scriptures. And as ye would handle the matter, I think so myself verily. For when all authority and judgment of the fathers and of the church is shaken quite off in any controversy, by whom shall we be tried? By the scriptures, ye say. But when both ye and we allege scriptures to a contrary purpose, and when we vary about the sense of the scriptures, by whom then shall we be judged? Perhaps ye will refer the judgment of doubtful matters to the Holy Ghost. We refuse not the arbitrement and umpireship of the Holy Ghost. For the same hath been promised by Christ to the church, to remain with the church for ever, to teach what things soever he said, to lead men into all truth.

And thus for judgment and trial of truth, we shall be returned to the church and to the fathers, by whom the Holy Ghost speaketh unto us, whose authority and due estimation ye go about to remove from us.

²³ [Hieronym. in Aggæ. "Sed "si traditione apostolica sponte
"et alia, quæ absque auctoritate "reperiunt atque confingunt [scil.
"et testimoniis scripturarum qua- "hæretici], percutit gladius Dei."]

But let us see what force ye bring to drive us from this hold. Making your battery against it, what shoot ye off but wind and paper? your artillery maketh a noise, but it giveth no blow. As in the last allegation ye falsified the sense of St. Augustine, so in this ye falsify both the sense and words of St. Hierom. The words, as ye allege them, seem to be spoken against whatsoever traditions of the apostles. Which words, or any the like to such purpose, were never uttered by any catholic doctor of the church, much less by St. Hierom. Look ye again and view better the place, ye shall say yourselves, that I find the fault of falsifying in you not without cause.

St. Hierom, in his Commentaries upon those words of the prophet Aggæus cap. 1. *Et vocavi siccitatem super terram, et super montes*: "I have called the drought to come upon the earth, and upon the hills," &c.: first, shewing the literal sense accordingly as the Hebrew word there by him noted signifieth *siccitatem*, "drought:" then treating mystically, as the seventy interpreters have turned that word into *romphæam*, that is, "a sword:" and understanding by the sword, the word of God, thereof taketh occasion briefly to say what this sword doth, how it destroyeth the negligent soul, which is expounded to be dry earth, and how it plagueth mountains that lift up themselves against the knowledge of God, whereby he meaneth heretics. Of whom he telleth, how they flatter the deceived people with their bread, wine, and oil, (by which he meaneth their heresies,) as it were with meats and drinks and refection.

"Their bread," saith he, "any man may very aptly call it, 'the bread of wailing,' and their wine, 'the madness of dragons, and the madness of serpents incurable,' and their oil, 'the promising of heavenly things,' wherewith they do as it were anoint their disciples, and promise them rewards of their labours: which the prophet detesteth, saying, 'the oil of the sinner shall not anoint my head.'" After this follow the words of St. Hierom, which ye have falsified to the intent they might seem to serve your false meaning: *Sed et alia quæ absque autoritate et testimoniis scripturarum, quasi traditione apostolica reperiunt, atque confingunt, percutit gladius Dei*: "But the sword of God striketh also other things, which the heretics" (for of them he speaketh) "devise and feign of their own heads, without the authority and witnesses of the scriptures, as though they came by tradition from the apostles." He that compareth this place with your falsified allegation, may soon espy great odds between them. For ye make St. Hierom to say, that all those things, which without the testimonies of scriptures are holden (so your allowed interpreter turneth *asseruntur*) as delivered from the apostles, be thoroughly smitten down by the sword of God's word. By this sword of your God's word, ye would quite smite down all apostolic traditions at a blow. But thanked be God, that your sword is a forged sword, a paper sword, a sword that neither with edge

cutteth, nor with weight beareth down. St. Hierom putteth not all things, which we have by tradition from the apostles without the express scriptures, to the sword of God's word. He speaketh not generally. His word is *alia*, "other things;" and ye make it *omnia*, "all things." Again, he speaketh of such things as be devised and feigned by heretics of their own brain, without authority and testimonies of the scriptures: unto which they give estimation, as though they came by tradition from the apostles. These circumstances and exaggerations do ye omit, and say, that St. Hierom putteth all apostolic traditions to that dreadful sword of God's word. Now what St. Hierom saith, we hold with it, and allow it well. But your saying we refuse, as falsely fathered upon St. Hierom. What he condemneth, we condemn. Neither can that place be justly alleged against us: for we invent not, ne feign not any things of our own accord, or of our own heads, as though they were delivered by the apostles besides the scriptures: that is the part of heretics, specially of the Tatians, as in that place St. Hierom saith. We find, devise, and feign nothing in the catholic religion. We do but keep and maintain things devised by the Holy Ghost, and left to the church by the apostles, or by apostolic men, or by the general councils, whose authority is in the church most healthful, saith St. Augustine. But concerning the force which the consent of the fathers had in the judgment of St. Hierom, it appeareth in his epistle to Evagrius: where, by the authority of the ancient doctors before his time, he proveth against an heretic, that Melchisedek was a man of the land of Canaan, and not the Holy Ghost.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Fain would M. Harding have his reader believe, that we utterly despise all holy fathers. But we despise them not, M. Harding, as may partly appear by that we have already said. We read their works: we reverence them: we give God thanks for them: we call them the pillars, the lights, the fathers of God's church: we despise them not. This thing only we say: Were their learning and holiness never so great, yet be they not equal in credit with the scriptures of God.

Augustin.
contra Cres-
con. Gram.
lib. 2. cap. 31.
[ix 430.]

Thus also saith St. Augustine: *Nos nullam Cypriano facimus injuriam, cum ejus quaslibet literas a canonica divinarum scripturarum auctoritate distinguimus*: "We offer no wrong to St. Cyprian when we sever any his letters or writings from the canonical authority of the holy scriptures." And again, joining all the doctors and fathers

together, he saith thus : *Ipse mihi pro his omnibus, imo supra* Augustin. ad
Hieron. epist.
19. [ii. 199.]
hos omnes, apostolus Paulus occurrit. Ad ipsum confugio :
ad ipsum ab omnibus qui aliter sentiunt literarum tracta-
toribus provoco : “ Instead of all these learned fathers, or
rather above them all, Paul the apostle cometh to my mind.
To him I run. To him I appeal from all manner writers”
(doctors and fathers) “ that think otherwise.”

So likewise St. Hierom : *Ego Origenem propter erudi-* Hieron. ad
Tranquillin.
tom. 2. [iv.
pt. 2. 589.]
tionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quomodo Tertulli-
anum, Novatum, Arnobium, Apollinarium, et nonnullos
ecclesiasticos scriptores Græcos pariter et Latinos, ut bona
eorum eligamus, vitemusque contraria : “ I think that the
ancient father Origen, in respect of his learning, may be
read sometimes, as Tertullian, Novatus, Arnobius, Apolli-
narius, and sundry other ecclesiastical writers, as well
Greeks as Latins, that in them we may take the good, and
flee the contrary.” Of this judgment were St. Augustine,
St. Hierom, and sundry others, whose words for shortness
I pass over : yet were they not therefore condemned as
despisers of the holy learned fathers. We remove you not,
as you say, from your hold, M. Harding. This is nothing
else but a courage of your countenance. The fathers ye
speak of are against you. I trust, it appeareth already by
your former writings, that, in the special cases that lie be-
tween us, ye have but few fathers to hold by.

Ye say, we evermore call you to the scriptures. This
fault I hope is not so heinous. Christ hath commanded us
so to do. “ Search ye,” saith Christ, “ the scriptures.” John v. 39.
And St. Hilary saith unto the emperor Constantius : *Fidem,* Hilar. ad
Imperat.
Constant.
[lib. 2. p.
1230.]
imperator, quæris ? audi eam, non de novis chartulis, sed de
Dei libris : “ Doth your majesty seek the faith ? hear it
then, not out of any new scrolls, but out of the books of
God.” He is rather to be suspected that fleeth the light,
and will not be judged by the scriptures.

When the scriptures be dark and doubtful, and are
alleged of both parts, then ye say ye refuse not the um-
pireship and judgment of the Holy Ghost. But ye add
farther, The Holy Ghost is promised only to the church.
Now by your opinion there is no church but the church

Petrus de
Palude, de
Potestate
Papæ, art. 4.

Heruæus de
Potest. Pa-
pæ, His præ-
missis.

of Rome. And the church of Rome is no church without the pope. For one of your great doctors saith: *Potestas papæ solius excedit potestatem totius residuæ ecclesiæ*: “The pope’s only power passeth all the power of the whole church besides.” And another like doctor saith: *Papa virtualiter est tota ecclesia*: “The pope by power and virtue is the whole church²⁴.” And thus your reason goeth round about, *a primo ad ultimum*: ergo, there is neither Holy Ghost, nor interpretation, or sense of the scriptures, but only in the pope. This is *summa summarum*: which thing being granted, what should a man seek any farther? The whole matter is at an end.

2 Pet. i. 20.

Matt. xi. 15.

Rev. iii. 7.

Acts xvi. 14.

It is true, as the scriptures were written by the Spirit of God, so must they be expounded by the same. For without that Spirit we have neither ears to hear, nor eyes to see. It is that Spirit that openeth, and no man shutteth: the same shutteth, and no man openeth. The same Spirit prepared and opened the silk-woman’s heart, that she should give ear to and consider the things that were spoken by St. Paul. And in respect of this Spirit the prophet Esay saith: *Erunt omnes docti a Deo*: “They shall be all taught of God.”

Isa. lxxv. 2.

Chrysostom.
de Sancto et
adorando
Spiritu, [iii.
808.]

But God hath not bound himself that this Spirit should evermore dwell in Rome; but upon the lowly and humble hearted, that trembleth at the word of God. Chrysostom saith: *Qui propria loquuntur, falso prætendunt Spiritum Sanctum*: “They that speak of themselves, falsely pretend the Holy Ghost²⁵.” And again: *Si quid præter evangelium sub titulo Spiritus obtrudatur, ne credamus..... Quia sicut Christus legis et prophetarum impletio est, ita est Spiritus evangelii*: “If any thing be brought unto us under the name of the Holy Ghost besides the gospel, let us not believe it. For as Christ is the fulfilling of the law and the prophets, so is the Holy Ghost the fulfilling of the gospel.”

²⁴ [The Editor has not succeeded in finding this work.]

²⁵ [Saville on the authority of Photius considers that this work may be St. Chrysostom’s, or at

least that of a writer of his age. The Bened. edd. reject it. The style is certainly more concise than St. Chrysostom’s.]

Now with what spirit the bishops of Rome have expounded unto us the holy scriptures of God, we shall shew it hereafter, as fitter occasion shall require. Here, you say, we have corrupted both the words and the sense of St. Hierom: that we have taken *omnia* instead of *alia*: and that you have devised and made nothing of yourselves: that St. Hierom meant not hereby the traditions of the apostles, but only the fond phantasies and dreams of the heretics called Tatians.

Of all these things we must needs confess one thing is true. Indeed we took *omnia* instead of *alia*: and so by oversight gave some occasion unto the quarreller. Howbeit, I doubt not but the indifferent gentle reader will soon pardon that fault. It proceeded only of negligence, and not of malice. Notwithstanding, this want may easily be supplied by a sufficient commentary. For Christ saith: *Omnis plantatio quam non plantaverit Pater meus cœlestis, eradicabitur*: "Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted out." Here, M. Harding, ye may borrow *omnia*, to help St. Hierom.

Matt. xv. 13.
Omnis.

Or, if this like you not, St. Cyprian may tell you: *Adulterum est, impium est, sacrilegum est, quodcunque humano furore instituitur, ut dispositio divina violetur*: "It is adulterous, it is wicked, it is abominable, whatsoever is ordered by the rashness of man, that God's order should be broken."

Cyprian. lib.
1. epist. 8.
[pp. 53. 54.]
Quodcunque.

It is true, St. Hierom speaketh not these words of the traditions of the apostles: it is true. Yet, M. Harding, he speaketh these words of such phantasies as were brought into the church of God, and magnified under the name and colour of the traditions of the apostles. So Eusebius saith, The heretic Cerinthus brought us in his own monstrous devices, under the pretence of revelations, as written by some great apostle.

Euseb. lib. 3.
cap. 25.
δι' ἀποκαλύ-
ψεων, ὡς
ὑπὸ ἀποστό-
λου γεγραμ-
μένων.
[1. 122.]

Such, M. Harding, be your inventions, wherewith ye have of long time deceived the world. One of your companions the suffragan of Sidon, at the late diet at Augusta, in the presence of the whole empire, doubted not to say, that your whole canon, word by word, even as it is now

Anno 1548.
Illyricus de
Sect. p. 109.
[ed. 1565.]

used in your masses, came directly from the apostles.

Your Hosius of Polonia saith, That the apostles appointed your orders of monks. Another of your side saith :

Christus dux et signifer [leg. *exemplar*] *vitæ monasticæ*²⁶ :

“Christ was the captain and standard-bearer of monks’ life :” imagining, I trow, that Christ was an abbot. And

yet afterward the same doctor, either by some oblivion, or

else upon some better remembrance, saith thus : *Elias et*

Elizæus duces [et *antesignani*] *instituti Benedictini*²⁶ :

“Elias and Elizeus were the first captains of St. Benet’s order.” And you, M. Harding, have told us often, that ye

have your private mass, your half communion, and I know

not what else, all from the apostles. And all this ye prove,

God wot, by full simple conjectures, because Christ saith

to his apostles, “I have many things to say unto you : but

ye are not able to bear them yet :” and because St. Paul

saith to the Corinthians, “I will order the rest when I

come :” hereby ye bear us in hand, that all your most

trifling vanities were brought unto you by St. Paul, even

from the third heavens.

And although it were true, that ye say, ye have not de-

vised these things of yourselves, but have received them

all from the apostles and holy fathers, which thing your

conscience knoweth to be most untrue, yet notwithstanding,

the same things so received ye have sithence foully

defaced with sundry your superstitions. Ye have made

them necessary to salvation : ye have bound the people to

them no less than to the law of God : and so have ye made

them snares of Christian consciences. Although the thing

itself came from the fathers, yet the abuse thereof came

from yourselves : and for the same ye have taught the

people to break God’s express commandment. Thus have

you blended God’s heavenly wine with your puddle-water :

thus have ye strained gnats, and swallowed camels. This

is the very leaven of the scribes and Pharisees, which

Christ calleth hypocrisy. Therefore albeit the thing itself

ye have thus received in respect of substance be all one,

²⁶ [Bishop Jewel probably confused these two quotations, and so placed “signifer” in the wrong place.]

In Conf.
Petricovien.
de Ceremo-
niis, p. 289.
[fol. 261. ed.
1557.]
Copus Angl.
Dial. 2. p.
194.

Copus Angl.
Dial. 2. p.
284.

John xvi. 12.

1 Cor. xi. 34.

Isa. i. 22.

Matt. xxlii.
24.

Matt. xvi. 12.

yet now, being thus abused, in respect of your superstitions and deformities it is not one.

The apostles and holy fathers used oil, yet they used it not, as ye do, for the salvation of body and soul.

Moses erected up the brasen serpent in the wilderness : Numb. xxi. 8.
yet not to be adored with godly honour, as it followed John iii. 14.
afterward.

God commanded the people to fast : yet not with hypocrisy, as the wicked fasted. And therefore God saith unto them : *Non est hoc jejunium quod ego elegi* : “ This is Isa. lviii. 5.
not the fasting that I have chosen.”

God commanded the people to keep the calends and new moons : yet not with such superstition and abuses as the people kept them. And therefore God said unto them, “ Who required these things at your hands ?”

Isa. i. 12.
[Vulgat.]

God commanded sundry bathings and washings : yet unto them that most precisely used the same Christ said : “ Woe be unto you ye scribes and Pharisees.....In vain Matt. xxiii. 25. [Xv. 9.]
they worship me, teaching the commandments and doctrines of men.”

Yet you, M. Harding, have infeoffed the apostles of Christ, not only with the substance of the things, which, ye say, ye have received by tradition, but also with all your abuses, superstitions, corruptions, and idolatries, which ye have devised of yourselves. And therein ye well resemble the Tatian heretics, of whom only, ye say, St. Hierom speaketh. But whether St. Hierom meant only I know not what fantastical dreams of the Tatians, (as you imagine only of yourself, without proof in particular, naming nothing,) or else also all such superstitious vanities as we have often and justly reprov'd in you, it may soon appear by these words immediately following : *Omnem laborem manuum, et jejunia eorum, et observationes varias, et χαμενυλας, id est, humi dormitiones* : “ All their handlabour, and their fastings, and their observations and usages, and hard sleeping on the ground.” These and such other like be the things which men imagine came from the apostles, and are stricken and consumed with the sword of God's word.

Hieronym.
in Aggæ, cap.
i. [iii. 1690.]

This, M. Harding, notwithstanding your long gloss beside the text, seemeth to be the very meaning of St. Hierom.

If ye will yet force the contrary, and turn all from yourselves to the Tatians, as you do, the very two lines next following must needs make you blush at your own error. The words are these: *Hæc autem universa, quæ dixi, possunt de ecclesiæ rectoribus intelligi*: "All these things that I have spoken, may be understood of the rulers of the church." Tell us no more therefore, M. Harding, of your Tatians. For St. Hierom himself telleth you, he meant not only them, but also the bishops and rulers of the church. And a little before he saith: *Infertur gladius super montes elevantes se adversus scientiam Dei*: "The sword of God's word is laid upon the mountains that lift themselves up against the knowledge of God."

[Ibid.]

Cyprian. ad
Pompeium.
[p. 141.]

In this sense writeth St. Cyprian: *Si ad divinæ traditionis caput, et originem revertamur, cessat omnis error humanus*: "If we return to the head and beginning of our Lord's tradition, all error of man must needs give place."

Tertull. de
Præscript.
Hæc. p. 81.
[cap. 32. p.
212.]

In like sense also writeth Tertullian: *Ipsa doctrina hæreticorum cum apostolica comparata, ex diversitate, et contrarietate sua pronuntiabit, neque apostoli alicujus auctoris esse, neque apostolici*: "The very doctrine of heretics compared with the apostles' doctrine, by the diversity and contrariety that is between that and the other, will soon pronounce sentence of itself, that neither apostle nor apostolic man was author of it."

Even thus it fareth, M. Harding, with a great heap of your doctrine. Ye say, ye have it by tradition from the apostles. Yet is it utterly void of all authority or testimony of the scriptures. And therefore, as St. Hierom saith, it is consumed and stricken down in the conscience of the godly, by the only sword of God's holy word, as our eyes see this day: and being compared with the apostles' doctrine (the difference and contrariety is so great) it easily bewrayeth itself, as Tertullian saith, that it never came from any apostle, nor from any other apostolic doctor of the church.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. *Divis.* 4.[Vol. iv. p.
14.]

St. Ambrose also to Gratian the emperor: "Let the scripture," saith he, "be asked the question, let the prophets be asked, and let Christ be asked. For at that time made the catholic fathers and bishops no doubt, but that our religion might be proved [*satis*] out of the holy scriptures. Neither were they ever so hardy to take any for an heretic, whose error they could not evidently and apparently reprove by the selfsame scriptures. And we verily do make answer on this wise, as St. Paul did: According to this way which they call heresy, we do worship God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and do allow all things which have been written either in the law, or in the prophets, or in the apostles' works."

[De fid. ad
Grat. Be-
ned. ed. ii.
451.]

M. HARDING.

Gratian the emperor buckling himself as it were to encounter with the heretic, at the first he giveth warning to all to beware of him, for that he endeavoureth to prove his false doctrine, (namely for the first point, that the Son is unlike the Father,) *versutis disputationibus*, "with subtle and crafty reasonings." He allegeth to that purpose St. Paul to the Colossians: *Cavete* Cap. 2. *ne quis vos deprædetur per philosophiam*: "Beware that no man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit," &c. "For," saith he, "these heretics put all the force of their poisons in logic or dialectical disputation, which by the opinion of philosophers is defined, not to have power to prove, but an earnest desire to destroy and disprove." Having given this wholesome warning, lest himself might seem to use that, which he counselth others to beware of: to withdraw the emperor and other from the guileful logic of Arius, at his first entry he saith: "I will not that thou give credit, holy emperor, to argument and to our disputation" (then follow the words whereof the defenders take hold): *Scripturas interrogemus*, &c.: "Let us ask the scriptures, let us ask the apostles, let us ask the prophets, let us ask Christ. What need many words? let us ask the fathers," &c.

And to this point of our belief, which is very high and secret, Ambros. de Fide, lib. 1. is that saying of St. Ambrose to be straitened. But that for cap. 4.

confirmation of the truth in points which be nearer to common sense, and for confutation of those heresies which be of less subtlety, of which sort these gospellers' gross errors be, to this end, that we ought not to use the testimonies of the holy fathers against heretics (for which purpose they allege this place): St. Ambrose neither in all that book, neither in all his works, speaketh so much as one word.

But contrariwise in sundry places of that work, he allegeth the authority of the Nicene council, as a testimony of good force against the Arians, and declareth a divine mystery to have been signified by such special number of the fathers there assembled, saying: *Sic nempe nostri secundum scripturas dixerunt patres*: "Even thus, according to the scriptures, have the fathers said." *Servemus præcepta majorum*, &c.: "Let us keep the precepts of our forefathers, neither with temerity of rude boldness let us break the hereditary seals," (he meaneth the doctrine sealed by the fathers, and left to the posterity as it were by heritage.) Which of us will be so hardy as to unseal the priestly book, sealed by the confessors, and now consecrated with the martyrdom of many a one? Lo hear ye not, sirs^a, how much St. Ambrose is against you?

a Nothing.

And though he say, touching this mystery, Let us ask the scriptures, apostles, prophets, and Christ: yet thereby doth he not quite exclude the fathers. He saith not, let us reject the fathers. The scriptures and the fathers be not contrary: and therefore the allowing of them, is not the disallowing of these. Whosoever maketh this argument^b which in your word is implied, The scriptures are to be asked, *ergo*, the holy fathers are not to be asked, maketh a foolish argument²⁷.

b Untruth.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The greatest force hereof is answered already. St. Ambrose, ye say, by this appeal to the scriptures, excludeth not the judgment of the learned fathers, but only the cavillations and subtleties of philosophers and sophisters. For St. Ambrose himself in the same treaty often allegeth the authority of the fathers. All this, M. Harding, is true indeed: notwithstanding there is a certain secret untruth lapped in it. For St. Ambrose allegeth the fathers, not as grounds, or principles, or foundations of the faith, but only as interpreters, or witnesses, or consenters unto the faith: which thing of our part was never denied. Now,

²⁷ [In this and in other parts of the Defence) has omitted several Harding's Confutation, bp. Jewel sentences, but such as are in no way material to the argument.]

whether St. Ambrose meant thus or no, let St. Ambrose himself be the judge. His words be these: *Sic nempe nostri secundum scripturas dixerunt patres*: "Thus have our fathers said" (not of themselves, but) "according to the scriptures." He allegeth the fathers, not as having sufficient credit and substance in themselves, but only as expounders and interpreters of the scriptures.

So saith the godly father Athanasius: *Nos ista hausimus a magistris divinitus afflatis, qui sacros libros evoluerunt*: "These things have we learned of our masters" (or fathers) "inspired from heaven, which have read and perused the holy scriptures²⁸." For St. Augustine very well saith: *Secundum hos libros de cæteris literis, vel fidelium, vel infidelium libere judicamus*: "According to those books of the scriptures, we judge frankly of all other writings, whether they be of the faithful, or of the unfaithful."

Therefore St. Hierom saith: *Omni studio legendæ nobis sunt scripturæ, et in lege Domini meditandum die ac nocte: ut probati trapezitæ sciamus, quis nummus probus sit, quis adulterinus* [leg. *adulter*]: "We must read the scriptures with all diligence, and must be occupied in the law of our Lord both day and night; that we may become perfect exchangers, and be able rightly to discern what money is lawful, and what is counterfeit." St. Hilary saith: *Hoc proprium est apostolicæ doctrinæ, Deum ex lege ac prophetis in evangelis prædicare*: "This is the very order of the apostle's doctrine, in the gospel to preach God out of the law and the prophets."

Otherwise, touching the discourse of natural reason, St. Ambrose saith: No creature either in earth or in heaven is able to reach the depth of these things. Thus he saith: *Mens deficit: vox silet, non mea tantum, sed angelorum. Supra potestates, supra angelos, supra cherubim, supra seraphim, supra omnem sensum est*: "The mind is astonished, the voice faileth, not only mine, but also of the

²⁸ [Athanas. de Humanit. Verbi. . . . ἐκείναι μὲν γὰρ (sc. αἱ γραφαὶ) διὰ θεολόγων ἀνδρῶν παρὰ Θεοῦ ἐλαλήθησαν καὶ ἐγράφησαν ἡμεῖς

δὲ παρὰ τῶν αὐταῖς ἐντυγχανόντων θεοπνεύστων διδασκάλων . . . μαθόντες μεταδίδομεν καὶ τῇ σῇ φιλομαθείᾳ.]

angels. It is above the powers, above the angels, above the cherubins, above the seraphins, and above all manner understanding." And therefore he saith, as it is alleged once before : *Nolo nobis credatur : scriptura recitetur : non ego dico a me, IN PRINCIPIO ERAT VERBUM, sed audio* : " I would not ye should believe me : let the scriptures be read : I say not of myself, IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE WORD, but I hear it spoken." And again he saith in the same book, unto the emperor Gratian : *Facescat nostra sententia, Paulum interrogemus* : " Let our judgment stand apart, and let us ask St. Paul the question." But M. Harding saith : " Whosoever maketh this argument which in your word is implied, The scriptures are to be asked ; *ergo*, the holy fathers are not to be asked, maketh a foolish argument."

It seemeth no great point of wisdom, M. Harding, to upbraid others with folly without cause : God increase both you and us in all wisdom and understanding in Christ Jesu. Howbeit, our argument, howsoever it hath pleased you to fashion and to handle it, as we meant it and made it, had no such folly. Wherefore, whatsoever folly is now come to it, it is your own : it is not ours. For we deny not the learned fathers' expositions and judgments in doubtful cases of the scriptures. We read them ourselves. We follow them. We embrace them. And, as I said before, we most humbly thank God for them. But thus we say, The same fathers' opinions and judgments, foras-much as they are sometimes disagreeable one from another, and sometimes imply contrarieties and contradictions, therefore alone and of themselves, without farther authority and guiding of God's word, are not always sufficient war-rants to charge our faith. And thus the learned catholic fathers themselves have evermore taught us to esteem and to weigh the fathers.

The ancient father Origen saith thus, as it is reported before : *Ex solis scripturis examinationis nostræ discretio petenda* [leg. *hujusmodi agnoscenda discretio*] *est* : " The discussing of our judgment must be taken 'only' of the scriptures." And again : *Sensus nostri et enarrationes*

Ambros. de Incarnatio-
nis Dominice
Sacramen.
cap. 3. [ii.
706.]

Ambros. ad
Gratian. Im-
perat. lib. i.
cap. 7. [ii.
464.]

Origen. in
Epist. ad
Rom. lib. 10.
cap. 16. [iv.
684.]
Ex solis.
Origen. in
Jerem. hom.
i. [iii. 129.]

sine scripturis testibus non habent fidem: "Our judgments and expositions without witness of the scriptures have no credit." Likewise St. Augustine: *Ego solis canoniciis scripturis debeo sine ulla recusatione consensum*: Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 61. [x. 158.] "My consent without exception I owe" (not unto any father, were he never so well learned, but) 'only' to the holy canonical scriptures." His reason is this: *Nam cum Dominus tacuerit, quis nostrum dicat, Illa, vel illa sunt? aut si dicere audet, unde probat?* Augustin. in Johan. tract. 96. [iii. pt. 2. 734.] "For whereas the Lord himself hath not spoken, who of us can say, It is this or that? or, if he dare say so, how can he prove it?"

And therefore he concludeth directly and in like words with St. Ambrose: *Ego vocem pastoris inquirō. Lege hoc mihi de propheta, lege de psalmo, recita de lege, recita de evangelio, recita de apostolo*: "I require the voice of the shepherd. Read me this matter out of the prophets, read it me out of the psalms, read it out of the law, read it out of the gospel, read it out of the apostles."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 10. Divis. 1.

Wherefore if we be heretics, and they (as they would fain be called) be catholics, why do they not, as they see the fathers, which were catholic men, have always done? why do they not convince and master us by the divine scriptures? why do they not call us again to be tried by them? why do they not lay before us how we have gone away from Christ, from the prophets, from the apostles, and from the holy fathers? why stick they to do it? why are they afraid of it? It is God's cause: why are they doubtful to commit it to the trial of God's word? If we be heretics, which refer all our controversies unto the holy scriptures, and report us to the selfsame words which we know were sealed by God himself, and in comparison of them set little by all other things, whatsoever may be devised by men, how shall we say to these folk, I pray you:

what manner of men be they, and how is it meet to call them, which fear the judgment of the holy scriptures, that is to say, the judgment of God himself, and do prefer before them their own dreams and full cold inventions: and, to maintain their own traditions, have defaced and corrupted now these many hundred years the ordinances of Christ, and of the apostles?

M. HARDING.

We do so. For they condemn those that went against the tradition of the fathers, and so do we. The scriptures consist John xiv. 26. not in ink and paper, but in the sense. Which sense the Holy Ghost by Christ's promise hath taught the church.

Epiphanius refuting the heretics which named themselves Hæresi 61. [1. 511.] Apostolics, saith, that the scriptures have need of speculation, Scripture needeth speculation. (that is to wit, to be well studied and considered,) to the end the force and power of every argument may be known. It behoveth us also, saith he, to use the tradition: for we cannot have all Tradition necessary, because things of the holy scripture. Thus Epiphanius. By tradition scripture hath not all things. without doubt he meaneth the sense and understanding received of the fathers. For that is the key of the word of God, as Recognition. lib. 10. St. Peter taught, by report of St. Clement. This sense and understanding of the law had the ministers of the law, to whom the traditions of Moses and of the elders came as it were by hands. Now we require you to admit this tradition, that is to say, the catholic sense and understanding of the scriptures, which hath been delivered unto us by the holy fathers of all ages, and of all countries where the faith hath been received. And then we will call you again to be tried by the scriptures.

This have the catholics laid before you oftentimes, and this do we shew you in this confutation. "He that despiseth you despiseth me," saith Christ of his church. Ye despise the catholic church, and therefore you despise Christ. Luke x. 16.

What need so many questions, sirs? your hot rhetoric sheweth more courage in word than victory in deed. Ye call us forth to the scriptures, as it were to the field. Ye strike us down with words before ye come to encounter. To shew your bravery in the muster, ye refer your controversies to the holy scriptures, ye report you unto the words sealed by God himself: but we the catholics, as ye pretend, stick at it, we be afraid of it, we doubt of the matter, we fear the judgment of holy scriptures, we prefer our own dreams and cold inventions. Well, now that ye have told your lusty tale, hear our sober answer. Oftentimes the true scriptures are stretched forth to serve evil and false pur- Great brags made by the defenders, of the assurance of the scriptures.

poses. The Jews went about by the scriptures to prove that Christ was not so much as a prophet. For they said, "a Search the scriptures, and see that a prophet riseth not out of Galilee." By the scriptures they would need shew him worthy to die.

a Untruth. For the words are otherwise.

John vii. 52.

John xix. 7.

"We have a law," quoth they, "and by our law he ought to die, because he hath made himself the Son of God." The devil by alleging scripture would have deceived our Saviour himself, and said unto him: *Scriptum est*: "It is written." The Arians were full of the scriptures, and by the same, as St. Ambrose writeth, went about to prove that Christ, the author of all goodness, was not good. It is written, quoth they, *Nemo bonus nisi unus Deus*: "None is good but only God." Likewise the Macedonians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians.

Matt. iv. 6.
De Fide, lib.
2. cap. i. [ii.
473.]

Mark x. 18.

Now in this case, yourselves doing the like, what may we do better than honour the scriptures, and seek for their right sense and understanding? *Scriptum est*: "It is scripture" (saith St. Ambrose to the allegation of the Arians) "I acknowledge, but the letter hath not the error: would God the Arians' interpretation had not." *Apices sine crimine sunt, sensus in crimine*: "The letters be without crime, the sense is in crime. From the understanding cometh heresy, not from the scripture: the sense, not the word, becometh to be a crime," saith St. Hilary. Sithence then all standeth in the sense, let us agree first upon the sense and interpretation of the scriptures, and then if we be not as ready as ye, come forth when ye list, upbraid us hardly, and say lustily, as here ye do, "Why stick they to do it? why are they afraid of it?"

Hilar. de
Trinit. lib.
2. [p. 789.]

As for the true sense and interpretation of the scriptures, where shall we find it, but, as before we said, in the catholic church? The church having Christ remaining with it all days to the end of the world, having by promise of Christ the Spirit of truth remaining in it for ever, having by God's own ancient promise both the words which the Father hath put in the mouth of Christ, and the Spirit which he put in him, whereby it may understand the meaning of God's words: we may not now seek for the true sense, understanding, and interpretation of the scriptures anywhere, but in the church. Your own doctor John Calvin himself, whom ye follow and esteem so much, admonisheth very well, and saith, "It is specially to be noted, that out of the church there is no light of the sound understanding of the scriptures." This ground being laid, on which each part must stand and be tried in, crow no more against us, boast yourselves no more: we fear not the judgment of the holy scriptures. Nay it is yourselves that fear this judgment. For your own conscience telleth you that on this ground ye are the weaker side. If ye stand with us on this ground, ye shall never be able to defend your master John Calvin's doctrine touching baptism, which he maketh to be of so little force against the manifest scripture. "Let every one of you," saith St. Peter, "be baptized in the

Matt. vii.
John iv.

Isa. lix. 21.

In Epist. ad
Hebræos.

Untruth.

Untruth. For he debaseth not the sacrament of baptism.

a Untruth.

Three evident untruths.

name of Jesus Christ, to remission of sins." Keeping this ground, aye shall be borne from your doctrine touching absolution, denying the priest to have power to absolve penitents by his priestly authority, but by preaching the gospel to them, contrary to the plain scripture: "Whose sins ye forgive, they are forgiven to them: whose ye retain, they are retained." If ye refuse not this ground, ye shall be forced to restore the sacrament of extreme unction, and the use of holy oil again, which ye have abandoned. For what have ye to say against the scripture, "Is any sick among you? let him cause the priests of the church James v. 14. to come in to him, anointing him with oil in the name of our Lord." Abiding in this ground, ye shall be driven to forsake your Zuinglian doctrine, which putteth signs and figures (1) only in the sacrament of the altar, for the true and real body of Christ there (2) present, contrary to the (3) clear scripture, "This is my body." Being on this ground, ye shall soon give over the maintenance of the doctrine of your special faith, and of your justification by faith only, as being contrary to the plain scripture, "Man is justified by works, and not by faith only." To con- James ii. 24. clude, (for, to shew in how many points ye may be confuted by evident scriptures, it were in manner infinite,) if ye will admit this for a good ground, as ye must needs admit, then shall ye not maintain the presumptuous doctrine of your certainty of grace and salvation, contrary to that St. Paul counselleth, "With fear Phillip. ii. 12. and trembling work your salvation."

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Whereas we make reasonable request, that God may be umpire in his own cause, and that all our controversies may be judged and tried by the holy scriptures, M. Harding thereto answereth thus: The scripture standeth not in the words, but in the sense, and the same sense is continued by tradition in the church. Otherwise, he saith, the Jews, the Arians, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, and all other heretics, were always able to claim by the scriptures. To conclude, he maketh up a great empty heap of the force of baptism, of holy oil, of extreme unction, of absolution, of signs, of figures, of only faith, and, as it liketh him to call it, of the presumptuous doctrine of the certainty of salvation: in every of which things, he saith, the scriptures are clear of his side, and directly against us.

To answer all these points in particular, it would require another book. But briefly to touch so much only as shall be needful. First, that the substance of the scrip-

tures standeth in the right sense and meaning, and not only in the naked and bare words, it is true, and generally granted without exception, and needeth no further proof. St. Hierom saith: *Non in legendo, sed intelligendo scripturæ consistunt*: "The scriptures stand, not in the reading, but in the understanding." And St. Hilary: *Non divinorum dictorum, sed intelligentiæ nostræ a nobis ratio præstanda est*: "We must yield an account, not of God's divine words, but of our own expositions."

Hieron. contra Luciferian. [iv. pt. 2. 306.]
Hilar. de Trinitate, lib. 4. p. 39. [p. 839.]

But if that only be the right meaning and sense of the scriptures, that within these few late hundred years is crosen into the church of Rome: and if it be all gospel, whatsoever it be, that arriveth from thence: and if they be all heretics, and schismatics, and despisers of Christ, and of the apostles, and of the universal church, that make stay at it, or cannot receive it, then is the whole matter already concluded: we shall need no more ado.

Ye say, the Jews, the Arians, the Nestorians, and other heretics alleged the scriptures. Yea verily, M. Harding, and that even with like faith, and in like sense, and to like purpose as you allege them now; as hereafter, I trust, it shall appear. By the way, for example hereof, in this very place, where you allege the words of the Pharisees avouching the scriptures, it may please you to remember, that either wittingly, or of some error and oversight, ye have manifestly corrupted the scriptures. For whereas you have translated the place thus: "search the scriptures:" the Pharisees said nothing else, but *scrutare et vide*: "Search and see:" and spake not one word of the scriptures. And although the matter import not much, yet to charge you with your own rule, which must needs be good against yourself, any small fault in God's word must be counted great. Indeed St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine seem to supply this word "scriptures," although it were not in the text.

John vii. 52.
Ἐρευνήσον,
καὶ ἰδὲ ὅτι
προφήτης
ἐκ τῆς Γαλι-
λαίας οὐκ
ἐγγήγερται.

Chrysostom.
Augustinus.

Touching the matter itself, Nicolaus Lyra saith: *Hoc verbum eorum simpliciter falsum est. Quia, si intelligatur de prophetis generaliter, aliqui fuerunt nati de Galilæa: videlicet, Elizæus, Tobias, et Debora prophetissa, et forte*

Nicol. Lyra
in 7. cap.
Johan. [v.
1151.]

plures alii: "This word of the Pharisees is plainly false. For if it be taken generally of all prophets, then were there certain of them born in Galilee, namely Elizæus, Tobias, Debora, and perchance others mo." In such sort, M. Harding, even with the like faith and credit, you also have used to allege the scriptures.

But whereto drive you all this long tale? will you in the end conclude thus: The Jews and heretics alleged the scriptures: *ergo*, faithful Christians may not allege them? or thus: Thieves have sometimes armed themselves: *ergo*, true men may not be armed? Nay, we may rather say thus unto you: The Jews and heretics alleged the scriptures; what account then may we make of you, that flee, and condemn, and burn the scriptures?

Certainly, notwithstanding Pharisees and heretics wickedly misalleged the scriptures, as ye sometimes do to serve your purpose, yet for all that, Christ said unto them: *Scrutamini scripturas*: "Search the scriptures:" and, as it is said before, the catholic learned fathers in all their cases and controversies appealed evermore to the scriptures.

John v. 39.

Cap. 9. Divis. I.

Where you say, the scriptures are so clear of your side, and make so directly against us: would God ye would indeed and unfeignedly stand to that trial. Your fancies and follies would soon come to ground.

Touching your great heap of examples, of the sacrament of baptism defaced, as you say, by M. Calvin; of absolution, of extreme unction, of holy oil, of signs, of figures, of only faith, and of the certainty of salvation, which you call presumptuous: first, of the sacrament of baptism, M. Calvin every where writeth with all manner reverence, calling it a divine and an heavenly mystery, and the sacrament of our redemption: wherein also sometimes he justly reproveth you, for that ye have so many ways so profanely and so unreverently abused the same. Of absolution we shall have occasion to say more hereafter.

Touching your oil, indeed in show of words, St. James seemeth to make somewhat for you. Notwithstanding, neither doth he call it holy oil, as ye do, neither doth he call it a sacrament of the church: nor doth he say, as ye

say, it should serve for the salvation of body and soul: nor doth he teach you to salute it, and to speak unto it as to a lively and reasonable creature, *Ave sanctum oleum*: "All hail holy oil:" nor with these words to minister it unto the sick: *Per hanc sanctam unctionem, et suam piissimam misericordiam, ignoscat tibi Deus*: "By this holy anointing, and his dear mercy, God pardon thee." To be short, it was a miraculous gift of healing, lasting only, as other like miracles did, for the time: not a necessary sacrament of the church to continue for ever.

As for the objection of signs and figures, for shortness of time, I must refer thee, gentle reader, unto my former Reply to M. Harding. The words of Christ, which are thought to be so plain, the ancient learned father Tertullian expoundeth thus: *Hoc est corpus meum: Hoc [id] est, figura corporis mei*: "This is my body: that is to say, This is a figure of my body." Likewise St. Augustine: *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui*: "Our Lord doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gave a sign of his body."

The 12th Article. [supra, vol. iii. 127.]

Tertullian. contra Marcion. lib. 4. [cap. 40. p. 458.] p. 233. Figure. Sign.

To rehearse all other like ancient authorities, it were too long. O what triumphs would master Harding make, if none of all the old learned fathers could be found, that ever had called the sacrament, the sign and figure of Christ's body? but, as before he alleged an imagined sense of the scriptures without words, so now he allegeth the words alone without sense. He should have remembered better, that St. Hierom saith: *Ne putemus in verbis scripturarum esse evangelium, sed in sensu*: "Let us not think the gospel standeth in the words of the scriptures, but in the meaning."

Hieronym. in. Epist. ad Galat. cap. 1. [iv. 230.]

Two other great quarrels master Harding moveth: the one of only faith, the other, as he calleth it, of the presumptuous certainty of salvation. Wherein judge thou uprightly, good Christian reader, how just cause he hath to reprove our doctrine.

As for the first hereof, St. Paul saith: *Justificamur gratis ex gratia ipsius*: "We be justified freely of his grace: we judge that a man is justified by faith, without the works of

Rom. iii. 24.

the law : we know that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Christ." M. Harding will say, yet hitherto of *sola fides*, that is, of "only faith," we hear nothing. Notwithstanding, when St. Paul excludeth all manner works besides only faith, what else then leaveth he, but faith alone?

Howbeit, if it be so horrible an heresy to say, We be justified before God by only faith, that is to say, only by the merits and cross of Christ, let us see what the holy learned fathers of the church so many hundred years ago have taught us thereof.

Ambros. in
Epist. ad
Rom. cap. 3.
[ii. app. 46.]

St. Ambrose saith : *Justificati sunt gratis, quia nihil operantes, neque vicem reddentes, sola fide justificati sunt dono Dei* : "They are justified freely : because working nothing, and requiting nothing, they are justified by only faith through the gift of God²⁹." Again : *Sic decretum est a Deo, ut, cessante lege, solam fidem gratia Dei posceret ad salutem* : "This was God's determination, that, the law surceasing, the grace of God should require only faith unto salvation."

Ambros. eo-
dem loco.
cap. 4. [ii.
app. 48.]

And again : *sola fides posita est ad salutem* : "Only faith is laid, or appointed unto salvation."

Ambros. in
Epist. ad
Rom. cap. 9.
[ii. app. 84.]
Basil. de
Humil. [ii.
158.]
Πίστει δὲ
μόνη τῇ εἰς
Χριστὸν δε-
δικαιωμένον.

St. Basil saith : *novit se esse inopem veræ justitiæ : sola autem fide in Christum esse justificatum* : "He knoweth himself to be void of true righteousness, and to be justified by only faith in Christ."

Theodoret.
De curandis
Græcorum
Affectibus,
lib. 7. [ed.
Gaisf. p. 291.]

Theodoretus saith : *Non ullis operibus nostris, sed per solam fidem mystica bona consequuti sumus* : "Not by any works of ours, but by only faith we have gotten the mystical good things³⁰."

Nazianzen.
περὶ εὐτα-
ξίας. [i. 596.]

Nazianzenus saith : *Δικαιοσύνη καὶ τὸ πιστεῦσαι μόνον : Credere solum est justitia* : "Only believing is righteousness."

Origen. in
Epist. ad
Rom. cap. 3.
lib. 3. [iv.
516.]

Origen saith : *Ubi est gloriatio tua ? Exclusa est..... Dicit sufficere solius fidei justificationem : ita ut credens quis tantummodo justificetur, etiamsi nihil boni operis fecerit* [leg. ab eo fuerit expletum] : "Where now is thy boasting"

²⁹ [This is not a genuine work of St. Ambrose.]

³⁰ [Theodoret. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ δι' ἔργων ἀξιεπαίνων, ἀλλὰ διὰ μόνης πίστεως τῶν μυστικῶν τετυχήκαμεν ἀγαθῶν.]

(of thy good works)? “It is shut out. Paul saith, that the justification of only faith is sufficient: so that a man only believing may be justified, although he have done no good work at all.”

Hesychius saith: *Gratia ex misericordia atque com-* Chesych. In
Levit. lib. 4.
cap. 14. [fol.
8r. B.] *passione præbetur, et fide comprehenditur sola.....*: “The grace of God is given only of mercy and favour, and is embraced and received by only faith.”

I leave a great number of others that have written the like, as well Greeks as Latins. Instead of them all, St. Chrysostom saith thus: *Illi dicebant, Qui sola fide niti-* Chrysostom.
in Epist. ad
Galat. cap. 3.
[x. 698.] *tur, execrabilis est: hic contra demonstrat, eum, qui sola fide nititur, benedictum esse*: “They said, whoso stayeth himself by only faith, is accursed: contrariwise St. Paul proveth, that whoso stayeth himself by only faith, he is blessed³¹.”

Touching the words of St. James, if M. Harding well considered the “equivocation” or double understanding of this word “justification,” he might soon and easily have espied his own error. For when St. Paul saith, “Abraham Rom. iv. was justified by faith without works of the law,” he teacheth us how Abraham was received into favour, and justified before God; of the other side, St. James, when he saith, “Abraham was justified by works, and not by faith only,” he speaketh of the works that follow justification, and of the fruits of faith: without which fruits, Abraham’s faith had been no faith.

St. Augustine saith: *Non sunt contrariæ duorum aposto-* Augustin.
in lib. 83.
Quæst.
quæst. 76. [vi.
68.] *lorum sententiæ, Pauli et Jacobi, cum dicit Paulus, justificari hominem sine operibus: et Jacobus dicit, inanem esse* James ii. 17. *fidem sine operibus. Quia Paulus loquitur de operibus, quæ fidem præcedunt: Jacobus de iis, quæ fidem sequuntur*: “The sayings of the two apostles, Paul and James, are not contrary, where as Paul saith: ‘A man is justified without works,’ and James saith, ‘Faith without works is in vain:’

³¹ [Chrysost. ἐκείνοι πάλιν ἔλεγον, ὅτι ὁ τῇ πίστει μόνῃ προσέχων, ἐνλογημένος.]
ἐπικατάρατος. οὗτος δὲ δείκνυσιν,

for Paul speaketh of the works that go before faith : James speaketh of the works that follow after faith."

If M. Harding shall think St. Augustine's authority herein is not sufficient, Thomas of Aquine will avouch the same. His words be these : *Jacobus hic loquitur de operibus sequentibus fidem : quæ dicuntur justificare, non secundum quod justificare dicitur justitiæ infusio : sed secundum quod dicitur justitiæ exercitatio, vel ostensio, vel consummatio. Res enim dicitur fieri, quando perficitur, vel innotescit* : "James in this place speaketh of such works as follow faith : which works are said to justify, not as justification is the procuring of righteousness, but in that it is an exercise, or a shewing, or a perfecting of righteousness. For we say a thing is done, when it is perfected, or known to be done."

Thom. Aquin. in
Epist. Jacob.
bi. cap. 5.
[leg. cap. 2.]

Rom. viii. 1.

[Vers. 16.]

[Vers. 38.]

Now concerning the assurance or certainty of salvation, the scriptures are full. St. Paul saith : "There is no damnation to them that be in Christ Jesu : " "the Spirit of God beareth witness to our spirit, that we are the children of God : " "I know that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor powers, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any creature else, shall be able to remove me from that love that God beareth towards me in Christ Jesu our Lord."

But forasmuch as these words perhaps have not the sense of the church of Rome, without which, in M. Harding's judgment, the scripture of God is no scripture, let us see the sense and exposition of the holy fathers.

Tertull. contra
Marcion.
lib. 5. [cap. 4.
p. 465.] p.
240.

Tertullian saith : *Ut certum esset, nos esse filios Dei, misit Spiritum suum in corda nostra clamantem, Abba, Pater* : "That we might be certified that we be the children of God, he hath sent the Holy Ghost into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father."

Clemens in
Pedag. lib.
1. cap. 6. [3.
121.]

Clemens Alexandrinus saith : *Re vera sanguis fidei est spes, in qua continetur, ut fides in anima. Cum autem spes expiraverit, perinde ac si sanguis effluerit, vitalis fidei facultas dissolvitur* : "Indeed hope is, as it were, the blood of faith : in which faith hope is contained, even as faith is

contained in the soul. And when hope is gone, then is all the lively power of faith dissolved, as if the blood were shed out of the body."

St. Cyprian saith: *Et tu dubitas et fluctuas? Hoc est Deum omnino non nosse: hoc est Christum credentium magistru[m] peccato incredulitatis offendere: hoc est in ecclesia constitutum, fidem in domo fidei non habere:* "And dost thou stagger and stand in doubt" (of thy salvation)? "That were as much as not to know God: that were as much as, with the sin of unbelief, to offend Christ the master of believers: that were as much as being in the church, in the house of faith, to have no faith."

Prosper saith: *Securi diem judicii expectant, quibus in cruce Domini gloriantibus mundus crucifixus est, et ipsi mundo:* "They unto whom the world is crucified, and are crucified unto the world, wait for the day of judgment without fear."

But to leave the ancient fathers of old time, and to put the matter quite out of doubt, one Antonius Marinarius in the late council of Trident in open audience said thus: *Si cælum ruat, si terra evanescat, si orbis illabatur præceps, ego in eum erectus ero. Si angelus de cælo aliud mihi persuadere contendat, dicam illi Anathema. O felicem Christiani pectoris fiduciam!* "If the heaven should fall, if the earth should vanish, if the whole world should come down headlong, yet would I stand prest³² and bold before God. If an angel from heaven would tell me otherwise, I would accurse him. O the blessed trust" (and certainty) "of a Christian heart!"

Certainly, M. Harding, it were a very presumptuous part to say, that these fathers, Greeks, Latins, new, old, your own and ours, were all presumptuous. If it be so presumptuous a matter to put affiance in the merits of Christ, what is it then to put affiance in our own merits? St. Paul hath taught us to say: "God forbid that I should glory, but only in the cross of Christ." St. Basil saith: *Qui non fidit suis meritis, nec expectat ex operibus justi-*

Cyprian. de
Mortalit.
serm. 4. [p.
230.]

Prosper. de
Promiss. et
Prædictionib.
Del. par. 1.
cap. 16.

Council. Tri-
dent. act. 1.
ann. 1546.
[Conciones in
Council. Trid.
Lovan. ed.
1567. p. 46.
col. 1.]

Galat. vi. 14.
Basil. in
Psal. xxxii.
[l. 141.]

³² [Prest; that is, "ready."]

μόνην ἔχει
τὴν ἐλπίδα
τοὺς οἰκτιρ-
μοὺς τοῦ
Θεοῦ.

ficari, unam et solam spem habet salutis suæ misericordias Domini: “Whoso trusteth not in his own merits, nor looketh to be justified by his own works, hath his only hope of salvation in the mercies of our Lord.”

Job xiii. 15.

So saith Job in all his miseries: *Etiam si me occiderit, sperabo in eum. Veruntamen vias meas in conspectu ejus arguam*: “Although he kill me, yet will I put my trust in him: notwithstanding I will reprove my ways before his sight.” So the prophet David: “In thee, O Lord, have I

Psal. lxxi. 1.

trusted: I will never be confounded.” This is no presumption, but a patient and an humble waiting for the redemption of the children of God. It is most true that

Philipp. ii. 12.

St. Paul saith: “We must work our own salvation with fear and trembling.” But this fear riseth in consideration of our own weakness and unworthiness: not of any distrust or doubt in God’s mercy. But rather, the less cause we find to trust in ourselves, the more cause we have to trust in God. Therefore St. Augustine³³ saith: *Præsume, non de operatione tua, sed de Christi gratia. Gratia enim salvati estis, inquit apostolus. Non ergo hic arrogantia est, sed fides. Prædicare quod acceperis, non est superbia, sed devotio*: “Presume thou not of thine own working, but of the grace of Christ. For the apostle saith: ‘Ye are saved by grace.’ Here therefore is not presumption, but faith. To proclaim that thou hast received, it is no pride, it is devotion.”

Augustin. in
Joban. tract.
22. [iii. pt. 2.
466.]

Again he saith: *Non mea præsumptione, sed ipsius promissione in judicium non venio*: “It is not of my presumption, but of his promise, that I shall not come into judgment.” St. Basil saith: *Paulus gloriatur de contemptione*

Basil. de Hu-
mil. [ii. 158.]
Καυχᾶται
Παῦλος ἐπὶ
τῷ καταφρο-
νήσῃ τῇς
ἐαυτοῦ δι-
καιοσύνης.
Ambros. de
Jacob. et
Vita Beata,
lib. 1. cap. 6.
[i. 451.]

justitiæ suæ: “Paul” (presumeth, and) “boasteth of the contempt of his own righteousness.” So saith St. Ambrose: *Non gloriabor, quia justus sum: sed quia redemptus sum, gloriabor: non quia vacuus sum a peccatis, sed quia mihi remissa sunt peccata. Non gloriabor, quia profui, neque quia profuit mihi quisquam: sed quia pro me Advocatus*

³³ [This sermon, incorrectly attributed to St. Augustine, is a mere transcript from the work of Ambrosiaster de Sacram. lib. 5. c. 4.]

apud Patrem Christus est : sed quia pro me Christi sanguis effusus est : “I will not glory for that I am a just man, but for that I am redeemed, therefore will I glory : not for that I am void of sin, but for that my sins be forgiven me. I will not glory for that I have done good to any man, nor for that any man hath done good to me, but for that Christ is my Advocate with the Father, and for that Christ’s blood was shed for me.”

Therefore St. Augustine saith : *Quid retribuam Domino, quod recolit hæc memoria mea, et anima mea non metuit inde ?* “What shall I render unto our Lord, for that I call to remembrance all these my sins, and yet my soul thereof is not afraid ?” August. Confess. lib. 2. cap. 7. [l. 86.]

To be short, thus saith St. Bernard : *Ubi tuta firmaque infirmis securitas et requies, nisi in vulneribus Salvatoris ? Tanto illic securior habito, quanto ille potentior est ad salvandum, &c. Peccavi peccatum grande : turbatur [leg. turbabitur] conscientia, sed non perturbabitur : quoniam vulnorum Domini recordabor. Nempe vulneratus est propter iniquitates nostras :* “What safe rest or surety can the weak soul find, but in the wounds of our Saviour ? As he is mightier to save, so dwell I there with more safety,” &c. “I have committed a great sin, my conscience is troubled, yet shall it not be shaken down, because I will remember my Lord’s wounds. For he was wounded for our sins.” Bernard. in Cant. Cantuar. cor. serm. 61. [iv. 1479.]

Thus, M. Harding, to be assured of our salvation, St. Augustine saith, it is no arrogant stoutness : it is our faith. It is no pride : it is devotion. It is no presumption : it is God’s promise.

But your whole doctrine of the trust in men’s merits leadeth directly to desperation. And therefore St. Cyprian saith well of you : *Asserunt noctem pro die : interitum, pro salute : desperationem, sub obtentu spei : perfidiam, sub prætextu fidei : antichristum sub vocabulo Christi :* “They teach us night instead of day : destruction instead of health : desperation under the colour of hope : infidelity under the pretence of faith : Antichrist under the name of Christ.” Cyprian. de Simpl. Præla. [p. 194.]

Now a little to view the grounds of M. Harding’s long

discourse : whereas he so often and so earnestly telleth us of the sense of the scriptures, as if we had scriptures without sense : his meaning thereby is only to lead us away to the sense of the church of Rome : which sense, Albertus

Albert. Pigh.
Hierar. lib. 1.
cap. 4. [cap.
2.]

Eckius de
Ecclesia.
[Loc. Com.
art. 1.]

Hosius in
Confessione
Petricovien.
cap. 80. [fol.
106. col. 3.]

Pighius saith, is the infallible and inflexible rule of truth.

Eckius saith : *Scriptura, nisi ecclesiæ autoritate, non est*

authentica : “ The scriptures of God are not authentical

or of credit, but only by the warrant and authority of the

church.” And Hosius in like manner : *Apostoli, cum sym-*

bolum traderent, nunquam dixerunt, Credo sancta Biblia,

aut sanctum evangelium : sed dixerunt, Credo sanctam ec-

clesiam : “ The apostles when they delivered the creed,

they never said, I believe the holy Bible, or the holy

gospel : but they said, I believe the holy church.” Thus

now the matter is sure enough for ever. We have neither

scriptures nor sense of scriptures, but only from Rome.

I will not here report the unsavoury senses that they

have imagined of the scriptures. One example or two for

a taste may be sufficient. Pope Boniface saith thus : *Ecce*

De Major.
et Obed.
Unam Sanc-
tam.

duo gladii hic : “ Behold here are two swords : that is to

say, the pope hath the power both of the spiritual sword,

and of the temporal.”

Psal. viii. 8.

Antonin. in
Summa, par.
3. tit. 22.
cap. 5.

Another saith : *Omnia subjecisti sub pedibus ejus, id est,*

papæ : pecora campi, id est, homines viventes in terra :

pisces maris, id est, animas in purgatorio : volucres cæli, id

est animas beatorum. These words St. Paul applieth only

unto Christ, meaning thereby, that God hath advanced

him above all powers and dominions, and that all things

are subject unto him. But the Roman sense is far other-

wise : “ Thou hast made all things subject unto him, that

is to say, to the pope : the cattle of the field, that is to say,

men living in the earth : the fishes of the sea, that is to

say, the souls in purgatory : the birds of the heavens, that

is to say, the souls of the blessed in heaven.” I leave

M. Harding
in his former
answer, art.
2.

M. Harding,
art. 2. & 10.

M. Harding’s own peculiar expositions : “ drink ye all of

this,” that is to say, as he gathereth in conclusion, “ drink

ye not all of this :” “ it is the substance,” that is to say, “ it

is the accidens.”

By such pretty senses, I will not say, as St. Hierom

saith : *De evangelio Christi facitis hominis evangelium, aut, quod pejus est, diaboli* : “Of the gospel of Christ ye make the gospel of a man, or, that is worse, the gospel of the devil.” I will not so say, but thus may I say with the prophet Esay : “Ye make light darkness, and darkness light.” Hieron. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. 1. [iv. 231.] Isa. v. 20.

Yet must we needs believe, upon M. Harding’s word, that the scripture without the sense of the church of Rome is no scripture. And therefore Hosius saith : *Si quis habeat interpretationem ecclesiæ Romanæ de loco aliquo scripturæ, etiamsi nec sciat, nec intelligat, an, et quomodo cum scripturæ verbis conveniat, tamen habet ipsissimum verbum Dei* : “If a man have the exposition of the church of Rome touching any place of the scriptures, although he neither know nor understand whether and how it agreeth with the words of the scripture, yet he hath the very word of God.” So saith Rabbi Abraham Hispanus, speaking of the expositions of the rabbins : *Licet videantur nobis verba nostra esse vera et recta, nobis tamen veritas abijcienda est in terram, quia veritas cum illis est* : “Notwithstanding our expositions seem to us never so true and right, yet must we throw our truth to the ground : for the truth indeed is with them.” Lyra likewise reporteth the common opinion the Jews had of their rabbins : *Recipiendum est quicquid hoc modo proponatur, etiamsi dicant dextram esse sinistram* : “We must needs receive whatsoever they lay unto us, yea although they tell us the right hand is the left.” Hosius de expresso verbo Dei. Rabbi Abrah. Lyra in Deuteron. cap. 17. [1557.]

Now, gentle reader, that thou mayest the better see the constancy and certainty of these senses and expositions whereunto M. Harding laboureth so earnestly to have thee bound, it may please thee to consider these words of Nicolaus Cusanus sometime cardinal in the church in Rome : *Non est mirum si praxis ecclesiæ uno tempore interpretatur scripturam uno modo, et alio tempore alio modo. Nam intellectus currit cum praxi. Intellectus enim qui cum praxi concurrit est spiritus vivificans.....Sequuntur ergo scripturæ ecclesiam* [supple, *quæ prior est et propter quam*

scriptura], *et non e converso* : “ It is no marvel though the practice of the church expound the scriptures at one time one way, and at another time another way. For the understanding or sense of the scriptures runneth with the practice : and that sense so agreeing with the practice is the quickening spirit. And therefore the scriptures follow the church : but contrariwise the church followeth not the scriptures.” For such kinds of expositions of the scriptures St. Hilary said sometime unto the Arians : *Fides ergo temporum magis [facta] est quam evangeliorum* : “ The faith therefore followeth the time, and not the gospel.”

Hilar. ad
Constantinum
Aug. [p.
1227.]

This is the sense of the church of Rome, whereby only M. Harding willeth us to measure and to weigh the word of God. But the ancient father Origen saith : *Sicut omne aurum quodcunque fuerit extra templum non est sanctificatum, sic omnis sensus qui fuerit extra divinam scripturam, quamvis admirabilis videatur quibusdam, non est sanctus, quia non continetur a sensu scripturæ* : “ As whatsoever gold is without the temple is not sanctified, so whatsoever sense is without the holy scripture, although unto some it seem wonderful, yet is it not holy, because it is not contained in the sense of the scripture.”

Origen, in
Matt. hom.
25. [al. 23.
tom. iii. 842.]

To conclude, whereas M. Harding saith, we cannot understand the scriptures without tradition, the ancient father Irenæus saith, this is one special mark whereby we may know an heretic : these be his words : *Hæretici, cum arguuntur ex scripturis, in accusationem scripturarum convertuntur, quasi non recte habeant, nec sint ex autoritate, et quod varie sint dictæ, et quod ex his non possit inveniri veritas ab illis qui traditionem nesciunt* : “ Heretics, when they be reproved by the scriptures, they fall to the accusing of the scriptures, as though either they were not well and perfect, or wanted authority, or were doubtfully uttered, or that they that know not the tradition were never able by the scriptures to find out the truth³⁴.”

Irenæus, lib.
3. cap. 2. [p.
174.]

³⁴ [In this passage from Irenæus many of the words are transposed.]

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 10. Divis. 2.*[Vol. iv. p.
74.]

Men say that Sophocles the tragical poet, when in his old days he was by his own sons accused before the judges for a doting and sottish man, as one that fondly wasted his own substance, and seemed to need a governor to see unto him: to the intent he might clear himself of the fault, he came into the place of judgment, and when he had rehearsed before them his tragedy called *Œdipus Colonæus*, which he had written at the very time of his accusation, marvellous exactly and cunningly, did ask the judges in his own behalf, whether they thought any sottish or doting man could do the like piece of work. In like manner, because these men take us to be mad, and appeach us for heretics, as men which have nothing to do neither with Christ nor with the church of God, we have judged it should be to good purpose, and not unprofitable, if we do openly and frankly set forth our faith wherein we stand, and shew all that confidence which we have in Christ Jesus, to the intent all men may see what is our judgment of every part of Christian religion, and may resolve with themselves whether the faith which they shall see confirmed by the words of Christ, by the writings of the apostles, by the testimonies of the catholic fathers, and by the examples of many ages, be but a certain rage of furious and mad men, and a conspiracy of heretics. This therefore is our belief.

M. HARDING.

The comparison which ye make between yourselves and Sophocles, gladly we admit. Yet we acknowledge that as in many respects ye are like, so in some unlike. Sophocles was a poet, that is to say, a feigner and deviser of things that be not true, but

fabulous. Ye also are feigners, and devisers of novelties, and followers of new devices that be false. Sophocles was a tragical poet : ye are tragical divines. A tragedy setteth forth the overthrowes of kingdoms, murder of noble personages, and other great troubles, and endeth in woeful lamentations. Your gospel invadeth Christ's heavenly kingdom the church, it murdereth souls bought with a most dear price, it causeth a hellish garboil in men's consciences, in the end it bringeth to everlasting weeping and gnashing of teeth. We take you not to be mad. Would God ye were not worse than mad. Were ye mad, ye should be tied up. Else were ye suffered to go abroad, for fear folk would fly from you. And then should ye do little hurt. Now whiles ye offer venomous kisses with sugared lips, whiles ye cover wolvisch cruelty under lambs' skins, whiles ye hurt under pretence of benefit, wound under colour of a medicine, beguile unstable souls with resemblance of truth ; neither stint ye to work mischief, nor others can beware of you.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Oh, M. Harding, Sophocles himself, if he were alive, were not able with all his eloquence to express the tragical dealings of your company. Your whole life and religion is nothing else but a tragedy. You have ript up the graves, and digged out the dead, and practised your cruelty upon the poor innocent carcasses.

Martin. Bucer. Paul. Phagius.

Platin. in Stephano 6.

Your pope Stephanus took up Formosus his predecessor's body, chopped off his forefingers, cut off his head, and threw out the naked carcass inter Tiber.

Sabellicus Enneade 9. lib. 2.

Your pope John the Twelfth cut off one of his cardinals' right hand, and another's nose.

Sabellicus Enneade 9. lib. 9.

Your pope Urbanus the First thrust five of his cardinals alive into sacks, and threw them out into the sea.

Beno Cardinalls. [lib. 2.]

Your pope Hildebrand poisoned six other popes his predecessors, to make himself come to the holy seat³⁵. They are so skilful there in these feats, that no man can tell neither what to fly, nor what to take, nor whom to doubt, nor whom to trust. They have conveyed their poison, I will not say into their meats or drinks, for that is over gross and common, but even in their mass books, into the sacrament,

³⁵ [This charge rests upon the work has been of late much dis-
evidence of cardinal Benno, whose credited.]

into the chalice. Camotensis³⁶, one of their own side, saith well of them: *Sine sanguinis effusione non ingrediuntur in sancta sanctorum*: "Without shedding of blood they enter not into that holy place, the holy of holies." Heb. ix. 22. Agrippa de vanit. scientiar. [de magistrat. eccl.]

Howbeit, what spend I these words? It is not possible to say all that may be said. They have inflamed wars. They have raised the subjects against their princes. They have armed the son against the father. They have overthrown cities and countries. They have deposed kings. They have set their feet on emperors' necks.

These matters, M. Harding, be tragical indeed. And herein standeth the whole practice and policy of your church of Rome.

Where you think yourself a sober man, in that you can so easily call us mad, and worse than mad, you may remember that this kind of eloquence amongst you is ancient and catholic, and may well stand with your religion. For so the false prophet Semeias said that Jeremy the prophet of God raved and was stark mad. So the wicked said unto Jehu of Elizeus the prophet, What hath this mad bedlam body to do with thee? Even so they said of Christ, that he was mad, and spake in fury he knew not what. St. Augustine saith of St. Paul: *Incidit in istorum sacrilegam dicacitatem: et ab eis qui sanari nolunt vocatur insanus*: "St. Paul is fallen into their cursed railing: and of them that will never be made sober is called a madman." So saith the ancient father Origen of Celsus the wicked heathen: *Videamus igitur nos, qui juxta hunc insanimus*: "Let us therefore consider hereof, that in this man's judgment are stark mad." Jerem. xxix. 26. 2 Kings ix. 11. Mark iii. 21. Augustin. in Psal. vi. [iv. 27.] Origen. contra Celsum, lib. 4.

But, M. Harding, wherein are we so mad? or what tokens of madness have we shewed? can no man either speak the truth or disclose your errors without madness? But, I trow, it is even as St. Jerome said sometime: *Delirabat, scilicet, qui in tuo regno contra tuam sententiam loquebatur*: "He raved, and was mad, no doubt, that within thy dominion spake any thing against thy mind." Hieronym. ad Pammach. contra errores Johan. Hierosolymit. [iv. pt. 2. 313.]

³⁶ [Camotensis. Supra, vol. ii. p. 217, note 46.]

Leo in Epi-
pha. serm. 5.
[1. 193.]

So saith Leo : *Insanis magistris veritas scandalum est, et cæcis doctoribus fit caligo quod lumen est* : “Unto frantic masters the truth is a slander : and unto blind doctors the light is become darkness.”

Augustin. in
Psal. xxxiii.
[Enar. 1. iv.
213.]

So saith St. Augustine of king David : *Insanire videbatur : sed regi Achis insanire videbatur, id est, stultis et ignorantibus* : “David seemed mad : but unto king Achis he seemed mad, that is to say, unto fools and idiots.”

Acts xxvi. 25.

As for our part, we remember what answer St. Paul made unto Festus in the like case : “O good Festus, I am not mad, but I utter unto thee the words of truth and sobriety.” Therefore we may comfort ourselves as the virtuous gentlewoman Paula did, when she was likewise supposed to be mad : *Nos stulti propter Christum : sed stultum Dei sapientius est hominibus* : “We are judged fools (and mad folks) for Christ’s sake : but the foolishness of God is wiser than men.”

Hieronym.
in Epitaphio
Paulæ. [iv.
pt. ii. 681.]

Cyprian. ad
Cornellium,
[contr. hæ-
ret. p. 84.]

But, M. Harding, St. Cyprian will tell you thus : *Hæc est, frater, vera dementia, non cogitare, nec scire, quod mendacia non diu fallant : noctem tam diu esse, quam diu illucescat dies* : “O my brother, this is madness indeed, not to think or know, that” (your) “lies cannot long deceive us, and that it is night no longer, but until the day spring. This indeed is very madness.”

And therefore Chrysostom saith : *Qui in manifestam foveam cadit, non negligens dicitur : sed insanus* : “Whoso falleth into a pit that lieth wide open, is not said to be negligent, but stark mad.”

The end of the First Part.

THE SECOND PART.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 1. Divis. 1.*

[Vol. iv. p.
15.]

WE believe, that there is one certain Nature and Divine Power, which we call God : and that the same is divided into three equal persons, into the Father, into the Son, and into the Holy Ghost : and that they all be of one power, of one majesty, of one eternity, of one godhead, and of one substance. And although these three persons be so divided, that neither the Father is the Son, nor the Son is the Holy Ghost, or the Father : yet nevertheless we believe, that there is but one very God : and that the same one God hath created heaven and earth, and all things contained under heaven.

We believe, that Jesus Christ the only Son of the Eternal Father, (as long before it was determined, before all beginnings,) when the fulness of time was come, did take of that blessed and pure virgin, both flesh and all the nature of man, that he might declare to the world the secret and hid will of his Father : which will had been laid up from before all ages and generations : and that he might finish in his human body the mystery of our redemption, and might fasten our sins to the cross, and also that handwriting which was made against us.

We believe, that for our sakes he died and was buried, descended into hell, the third day by the power of his Godhead returned to life and rose again, and that the fortieth day after his resurrection, whiles his disciples beheld and looked upon him, he ascended into heaven to fulfil all things, and did place in majesty and glory the selfsame body wherewith he was born, wherein he lived on earth, wherein he was jested at, wherein he had suffered most painful torments and cruel kind of death, wherein he rose again, and wherein he ascended to the right hand of the Father, above all rule, above all power, all force, all dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come: and that there he now sitteth, and shall sit till all things be full perfected. And although the majesty and Godhead of Christ be every where abundantly dispersed, yet we believe, that this body, as St. Augustine saith, must needs be still in one place: and that Christ hath given majesty unto his body, but yet hath not taken away from it the nature of a body: and that we must not so affirm Christ to be God, that we deny him to be man: and, as the martyr³⁷ Vigilus saith, that Christ hath left us as touching his human nature, but hath not left us as touching his divine nature: and that the same Christ, though he be absent from us concerning his manhead, yet is ever present with us concerning his Godhead.

From that place also we believe that Christ shall come again to execute that general judgment, as well of them whom he shall then find alive in the body, as of them that shall be already dead.

³⁷ [Vigilius Tapsitanus, not the martyr Vigilus Tridentinus. Supra, vol. ii. 415, note ⁸.]

Augustin.
tract. 50. in
Johan. [iii.
pt. 2. 634.]

Acts iii. 21.

In Epist. ad
Dardanum.
[ii. 681.]

Contra Eu-
tychem, lib.
i. [Bibl. Patr.
viii.]

Fulgent. ad
Thrasymun-
dum.

M. HARDING.

In our fathers' days, before any change in religion was thought upon, Christian people lived together in perfect unity. If account of belief had been demanded, ^anone was ashamed of the common Apostles' Creed. Every one constantly confessed, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ," and so forth. But sithence Luther brought a ^bnew gospel into the world, we have seen great diversity among men, not only of ceremonies and administration of the sacraments, but also of the public confession of the faith. For as sundry rulers, countries, and commonweals received that new doctrine: ^cso ^cManifest untruth: for we keep all one creed.

[Lib. ad Const. Aug.]
St. Hilary's
complaint of
many faiths.

One God,
one faith.

St. Hilary in his time complaining thereof, "Nowadays there be," saith he, "so many faiths as there be wills: so many doctrines as there be manners: so many causes of blasphemies spring up as there be vices: whiles faiths either are so written as we list, or so understood as we list. And whereas there is but one God, one Lord, one baptism, and according thereto one faith, we step aside from that which is the only faith, and, whiles mo faiths be made, they begin to come to that point, that there be no faith at all."

The manner
of the utter-
ance of the
defenders'
faith, strange
to Christian
ears.

But the manner of the utterance of your faith is strange to Christian ears, who have been accustomed to hear, *Credo in Deum, credo in Jesum Christum, credo in Spiritum Sanctum*: "I believe in God, I believe in Jesus Christ, I believe in the Holy Ghost." That other form of words which you use, soundeth not so Christianlike. "I believe there is a God, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of the Father, I believe that the Holy Ghost is God." Although this form of words do express a right faith, yet being such as may be uttered by devils, and hath ^dalways been uttered by heretics their ministers; the ancient and holy fathers have liked better the old form and manner: after which every Christian man saith, "I believe in God, I believe in Jesus Christ, I believe in the Holy Ghost." For this importeth a signification of faith with hope and charity: that other of faith only, which the devils have and tremble, as St. James saith: wherein, as in many other things, these defenders resemble them. St. Augustine in sundry places putting a difference between these two forms of words, upon St. John alleging St. Paul's words, "to one that believeth in him who justifieth the wicked, his faith is imputed to righteousness," demandeth, what is it to believe in him? It is by his answer: *Credendo amare, eredendo diligere, credendo in eum ire, et ejus membris incorporari*: "With believing to love him, with believing to go into him, and to be incorporate in his members, that is, to be made a member of his body."

James ii. 19.

[In Johan.
tract. 29.]

The article
of Christ's
ascension
much grated
upon by the
defenders to
evil purpose.

As this defender proceedeth in declaring the belief of his new English church, he grateth much upon the article of Christ's

ascension, as the manner is of all Zuinglians to do. For their mind giveth them, thereby they shall be able to bring at least many of the simpler sort to their sacramentary heresy, and to think that the body of Christ, wherein he ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, is so absent from earth, as it may not be believed to be here present in the sacrament of the altar. Thereto he allegeth St. Augustine, making him to say, that Christ's body wherein he rose again must needs be still in one place. In which treatise that holy father hath not the word *oportet*, that is, *must needs*, as this defender allegeth, but this word *potest*, that is, *may*, as the books have that be not corrupted by the maintainers of that heresy³⁸. And whereas he saith, *Ad Dardanum*, alleged by this defender, "though Christ hath given majesty unto his body, yet he hath not taken away from it the nature of a body:" this is not to be stretched to Christ's body in the sacrament, where it is not after condition of nature, but by the almighty power of his word. And although he hath not taken away from his body the nature of a very body, yet may it please him to do with his body, being God no less than man, that which is besides and above the nature of a body. So it pleased him to do when he said: "This is my body." And so it pleaseth him to be done, whensoever the same body is offered in the daily sacrifice of the church according to his commandment and institution. That Vigilius saith: "Christ hath left us touching his human nature, but hath not left us as touching his divine nature:" it is to be understood of his visible shape, in which he shewed his human nature, when he walked here on earth, when he was so conversant with men sensibly, that, as St. John writeth, they heard him with their ears, they saw him with their eyes, they beheld him, and touched him with their hands. As touching his human nature in this sensible wise, Christ hath left us: after which St. Augustine saith: *Jam non invenis Christum loqui in terra*: "Now thou findest not Christ to speak on the earth." This manner of Christ's human nature, being taken from us, withstandeth not, but that we may have the substance of his natural body and blood present in the blessed sacrament in a mystery, by the almighty power of his word: which faith these defenders travail to impugn. And (as God would) the penman of this Apology bringeth unawares, as it seemeth for confirmation of his sacramentary doctrine, that out of Fulgentius, which overthroweth all that he went about to build against the real presence. That father, as he is by him alleged, saith: *Christum*,

In Johan.
tract. 30.
Oportet for
potest.

Matt. xxvi.

Contra Euty-
chem, lib. i.
How Christ
hath left to
be now in
earth.

1 John

Exposition in
Epist. Johan.
tract. 10.

Ad Thrasymundum
regem.

³⁸ [Bp. Jewel's conduct here is hardly free from blame. Harding is quite correct in asserting that *Augustine's* reading is "potest," and not "oportet," which latter reading is certainly given by Gratian, Ivo, Petr. Lombard,

and Aquinas. Jewel therefore (though himself excused by these authorities) has no right to characterise Harding's assertion as "untruth," particularly as he farther on virtually gives up the point. See vol. ii. p. 394, note ⁹¹.]

Untruth.
For St. Augustine's
word is
oportet.

St. Augustine
knew no
such body in
the sacrament.

Untruth.
There is neither such
institution,
nor such
commandment.

cum absit a nobis per formam servi, tamen semper esse nobiscum per formam Dei: "That whereas Christ is absent from us according to the form of a servant, yet he is ever present with us according to the form of God." Whereby he meaneth, that Christ is no more here among men, as he was before his death, in form and shape of man, in such wise as we see men live on the earth. Which words, because they seem to dash their whole purpose, the prelates of this new English church have altered the sense of them, by shifting in this word "manhead" instead of "the form or shape of a servant," which the Latin hath, and this word "godhead" instead of "the form of God"³⁹.

Untruth.
For form and
substance
are both one.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I marvel, M. Harding, that ye can publish so manifest untruth without blushing. Ye say, that before these few late years, there was but one form of faith throughout the world. Yet being learned, and having travelled through the ancient writers, you must needs have seen the Apostles' creed, the Nicene creed, St. Basil's creed, Damasus' creed, St. Hierom's creed, St. Cyprian's or Rufines' creed, Gregorius' creed; the creed called *Quicumque vult*, written, as some think, by Athanasius, as some others, by Eusebius Vercellensis; the creed contained in the hymn called *Te Deum*, whether it were written by St. Augustine or by St. Ambrose: every of these under several and sundry forms. You know, that in divers of the oldest councils, as occasion was offered, so somewhat was either added to the creed, or diminished, or altered: as it may appear by Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoretus, Sozomenus, Evagrius, Nicephorus, and others. You know, that St. Augustine unto Laurentius, St. Hierom unto Cyrillus, St. Ambrose unto the emperor Gratianus, and others mo, in declaration of the Christian faith, have not always used one precise form of words: and that the emperor Constantine maketh open protestation of his faith, as it is recorded in counterfeit Donation, in sense and substance agreeing with all others that were catholic, but in words far disagreeing from all others, and peculiar only to himself. To be short, you know, that between your mass-creed and the people's

³⁹ [Here Harding enlarges upon the falsehood of the lady A. B's. translation of the Apology; and this, as well as other parts of the Confutation, as being nothing to the purpose, bp. Jewel omits.]

common creed, as touching the words, there was great difference. It were too long to rehearse all. Neither was it necessary to say so much, saving only to shew the manifest vanity of your talk. To express one substance of faith in sundry forms of words, I never heard it was forbidden, saving only now at the last by this late decree of M. Harding.

Where you say, the whole people before these few late years had one faith, ye should rather have said, they were all taught by you in a strange unknown tongue, to pronounce, as they could, a strange unknown form of faith. For, God knoweth, they understood not one word what they said, nor scarcely one article of their belief. St. Hilary saith of the people deceived by the Arians, as these have been by you: *Credunt quod non credunt: intelligunt quod non intelligunt*: "They believe that which they believe not: they understand that which they understand not." Cardinal Ascanius had a popinjay that was taught to say distinctly all the articles of the creed, from the beginning to the end. Yet, I trow, ye will not say the same popinjay believed in God, or understood the Christian faith. For faith is in the heart, not in the tongue.

Coelius Rhodigin. Anti-quit. lib. 3. cap. 32.

Augustin. de Baptismo contra Donatist. lib. 3. cap. 14. [ix. 114.]

St. Augustine saith: *Fieri potest, ut integra quis teneat verba symboli, et tamen non recte credat*: "It is possible that a man may pronounce the whole words of the creed, and yet not have the right faith." Indeed St. Hilary, of whom ye speak, worthily reproveth the Arian heretics, for that they had altered the whole faith of Christ, not only in words, but also in substance. But we having published sundry confessions of our religion, as the multitudes of your abuses and errors offered occasion, and that in sundry countries and kingdoms, in such distance of places and diversity of speeches, yet notwithstanding in the substance and grounds of the truth have evermore joined together, and never altered.

Where we say, We believe there is one God, M. Harding answereth, He cannot well allow this form of speech. We should rather have said, saith he, we believe in God. Were not this controller so importune, such simple petite quarrels should not be answered. I could never have

thought it had been so great a sin to believe that God is God. Verily, M. Harding, if every of your popes and cardinals had believed so much, I trow, Cornelius the bishop of Bitonto in your late council at Trident would not so bitterly and in so open sort have cried out of them :

Utinam non a fide ad infidelitatem [suppl. *quin*] *a Deo ad Epicurum*, [suppl. *vel ad Pythagoram*] *velut prorsus unanimes declinassent, dicentes in corde impio, et ore impudico, Non est Deus* : “ Would God they were not gone as it were with one consent from the faith to infidelity, from God to Epicure, saying with wicked heart and shameless mouth, There is no God.”

Cornelius Bitontinus in Concil. Trident. [Conciones in Concil. Trid. ed. Lovan. 1567, p. 15. col. 1.]

If no catholic writer had ever used the selfsame form of speech before, then might M. Harding’s quarrel seem to have some reasonable ground. But both St. Paul, and also many other catholic fathers have often used it. St. Paul saith : *Accedentem ad Deum oportet credere, Deum esse* : Heb. xi. 6.

“ He that cometh to God must believe that there is a God.” And Hermes, St. Paul’s scholar, commonly called

Pastor Nuntius : *Ante omnia crede unum Deum esse, qui condidit omnia* : “ Before all other things believe that there is one God that hath made all.”

Pastor Nuntius.

Origen saith : *Primum credendus est Deus, qui omnia creavit* : “ First we must believe there is a God that hath created all things.” St. Hilary saith : *In absoluto nobis et facilis, [leg. ac facili] est æternitas, Jesum (Christum) a mortuis suscitatum credere* : “ Our

Origen. Περὶ Ἀποχώρας. In proœmio. [l. 47.]

everlasting life is ready and easy, to believe that Jesus Christ is risen again from the dead.” Likewise Charles the Great in the creed published in his name : *Prædicandum est omnibus, ut credant, Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum unum esse Deum omnipotentem* : “ The gospel must be preached unto all, to the end they may know that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is one God Almighty.” To be short, even in our late fathers’ days,

Hilar. de Trinitat. lib. 10. [p. 1080.]

this was counted a catholic form of faith, and was commonly taught in all schools : *Unum crede Deum* : “ Believe that there is one God.” If this were then well spoken and universally used, even in the church of Rome, without rebuke, I trust, M. Harding of his courtesy will no more blame us for speaking well. As for these phrases, “ I

Symbolum Caroli Magni.

believe in God," "I believe in Christ," although indeed they be better, and more effectual, and carry more force than the other, yet are they not neither so peculiar and special to God alone, nor so precisely used, as M. Harding imagineth. For it is written in the book of Exodus, as it is noted by the skilful in the Hebrew tongue: *Populus credidit in Deum et in Mosen*: "The people believed in God and in Moses." And God himself said unto Moses,

Exod. xiv.
31.

as it is likewise noted in the Hebrew: *Descendam, ut populus in te credat*: "I will go down, that the people may

Basil. de Spi-
rit. Sanct.
cap. 14. [lii.
25.]
εἰς Μωσὴν
ἐβαπτίσθη-
σαν, καὶ
ἐπίστευσαν
εἰς αὐτόν.

Hosius in
Confess. Pe-
tricioven.
cap. 58. [fol.
73. col. 3.]

Socrat. lib. 1.
cap. 25. [ii.
61.]

Paschasi.
lib. 1. de
Spirit. Sanct.
[Magn. Bibl.
Patr. Colon.
1618. tom. 5.
p. 734. col. 2.]

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
29. [lii. pt.
2. 515.]

believe in thee." St. Basil saith: *Baptizati sunt in Mosen, et crediderunt in illum*: "They were baptized in Moses, and believed in him." And Hosius saith: *Quid si in sanctos quoque recte credi docet Paulus?* "What if Paul teach us, that we may also well believe in saints?" And they of M. Harding's side have evermore well liked this form of speech: *Credo in sanctam ecclesiam*: "I believe in the holy church." Wherein also perhaps they will allege these words of Socrates, and of some others: *Credo in unam catholicam ecclesiam*: "I believe in one catholic church." Notwithstanding, beside St. Augustine and others, Paschasius saith: *Credimus ecclesiam, quasi regenerationis matrem non credimus in ecclesiam, quasi regenerationis authorem..... Recede ergo ab hac persuasione blasphemiae. Non enim licet, nec in angelum credere*: "We believe the holy church, as the mother of regeneration: but we believe not in the church, as the author of regeneration. Leave therefore this persuasion of blasphemy. For it is not lawful to believe, no not in an angel⁴⁰." Likewise St. Augustine saith: *Credimus Paulo, non credimus in Paulum: credimus Petro, non credimus in Petrum*: "We believe Paul, but we believe not in Paul: we believe Peter, but we believe not in Peter."

Hereby we may see, that whether we say, "We believe

⁴⁰ ["Credimus ecclesiam quasi regenerationis matrem, non in ecclesiam credimus quasi in salutis authorem," &c. &c. "Qui in ecclesiam credit in hominem credit. Non enim homo ex ecclesia, sed ecclesia esse cepit ex

"homine. Recede itaque ex hac blasphemiae persuasione, ut in aliquam humanam te aestimes debere credere creaturam; cum omnino nec in angelum et in archangelum sit credendum."

that God is God," or, "We believe in God," both these phrases are used of the godly, and are therefore both good and catholic. If M. Harding find any want or imperfection in our words, let him supply it with good favour: so he condemn not either St. Paul, or Hermes, or Origen, or Hilary, or Charles the Great, or other catholic and godly writers, as well Greeks as Latins, who, as I have shewed, have used the like. Certainly the general confession of all our people, and of our whole church, is this: "We believe in God: we believe in Christ: we believe in the Holy Ghost."

But M. Harding saith, we grate over-busily upon the article of Christ's ascension into heaven. What then? should we have left it out? Verily that would have been some good countenance to your cause. And therefore, when pope Nicolas would have brought us your new article of transubstantiation into the creed, he should first have utterly removed this whole article of Christ's ascension. For these two articles may not well stand together by any construction in one creed. As for us, we have said nothing herein, but that hath often been said and avouched by the holy learned fathers. Damasus the bishop of Rome in his creed grateth hereon as much as we. His words be these:

Devicto mortis imperio, cum ea carne in qua natus, et passus, et mortuus fuerat, et resurrexit, ascendit ad patrem, sedetque ad dextram ejus in gloria: "Having overcome the empire of death, with the same flesh wherein he was born, and suffered, and died, and rose again, he ascended unto the Father, and sitteth at his right hand in glory." Which words St. Hierom in larger manner expoundeth thus:

Ascendit ad cælum, sedet ad dextram Dei Patris, manente ea natura carnis in qua natus, et passus est, et in qua resurrexit. Non enim exinanita est humanitatis substantia, sed glorificata: "Christ ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, the same nature of flesh wherein he was born, and suffered, and rose again, remaining still. For the substance of his human nature was not done away, but glorified." Howbeit, gentle reader, for thy better satisfaction herein, I must refer thee over to my former reply to M. Harding.

Symbolum
Damasi apud
Hier. tom. 4.
[v. 122.]

Hieronym.
in Explica-
tione Symb.
tom. 4. [v.
123.]

In the Sixth
Article.
[Supra, vol.
ii.]

De Con. Dist.
2. Prima.

Oportet.
Potest.

Acts iii. 21.

Cyril. in
Johan. lib.
ii. cap. 3.
[iv. 932.]

Augustin.
contra Fau-
stum, lib. 20.
cap. 11. [viii.
341.]

Augustin. ad
Dardan.
epist. 57. [ii.
692.]

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
33. [iii. 883.]

Here followeth a piteous outcry, that we have shamefully corrupted St. Augustine's words, shifting in *oportet* instead of *potest*. What new fancy is suddenly fallen into M. Harding's head I cannot tell. St. Augustine's words, as they be alleged by Gratian, are these: *Corpus in quo resurrexit in uno loco esse oportet*: "The body wherein Christ rose again must needs be in one place." Here is not *oportet* instead of *potest*, as M. Harding saith, but *oportet*, as it should be, for *oportet*. If there have been any corruption wrought herein, it hath been wrought by Gratian well near four hundred years ago, and not by us. Yet is Gratian one of the highest doctors of M. Harding's side. And will M. Harding make us believe that his own catholic doctors would be so bold to corrupt St. Augustine?

As for this verb *oportet*, if it were wanting in the place alleged, yet might it well and easily be supplied of other places. St. Peter saith: *Oportet illum cœlos capere usque ad tempora restitutionis omnium*: "The heavens must contain or hold him until the time that all things be restored." So saith Cyrillus: *Christus non poterat cum apostolis versari in carne postquam ascendisset ad Patrem*: "Christ could not be conversant with his apostles in the flesh, after he had ascended unto the Father." Likewise saith St. Augustine: *Christus secundum præsentiam corporalem, in sole, in luna, et in cruce simul esse non potuit*: Christ, according to the presence of his body, could not be in the sun, in the moon, and on the cross at one time." And again: *Ne dubites Christum esse in aliquo loco cœli, propter veri corporis modum*: "Doubt not but Christ is in some one place of heaven, because of the measure or form of a very body." Therefore the old learned father Origen saith: *Non est homo qui est ubicunque duo vel tres in ejus nomine fuerint congregati, neque homo nobiscum est omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi: neque congregatis ubique fidelibus homo est præsens: sed virtus divina quæ erat in Christo*: "It is not Christ, as being man, that is wheresoever two or three be gathered together in his name: neither Christ, as being man, is with us all days unto the world's end: nor Christ, as being man, is present with the faithful every where gathered together: but that divine power" (or

nature) “that was in Christ.” And for that cause St. Augustine saith: *Videte ascendentem: credite in absentem: sperate venientem: sed tamen per misericordiam occultam etiam sentite præsentem*: “See you Christ ascending into heaven: believe in him being absent: trust in Christ that is to come: and yet by his secret mercy feel him present.” Thus, M. Harding, thus have the old catholic learned fathers used to grate, as ye term it, upon the article of Christ’s ascension.

You say, St. Augustine in his epistle to Dardanus spake not of Christ’s body as it is now present in the sacrament. No marvel. For St. Augustine never understood any such kind of presence. And who taught you, M. Harding, that Christ hath such change of divers bodies, of one manner in the sacrament, and of another manner in heaven? Christ’s blessed body, when it was born of the Virgin, when it died, when it rose again, when it ascended into heaven, was one, and uniform. How became it afterward so diverse, and so unlike itself? If either Christ, or the apostles, or the ancient Fathers have thus taught you, why are they not alleged? If they have not thus taught you, how came ye by this knowledge? or if ye say ye know that they knew not, who will believe you?

Ye tell us that the body of Christ in heaven hath the whole stature, and form, and proportion of a man. This is true. It is the doctrine of the apostles, and of the ancient doctors of the church. But ye tell us farther of yourself, that the body of Christ in the sacrament is utterly void of all manner either stature, or form, or proportion: that is to say, is neither long, nor short, nor high, nor low, nor thick, nor thin: and being, as you say, a very natural body, yet hath neither likeness, nor shape of a body. This is your doctrine, M. Harding, and the more unlikely to be true, the more likely to be yours.

Such fantastical imaginations the Arian heretics sometime had of the Godhead of Christ. For thus they wrote thereof, as saith Athanasius: *Creatura est: sed non ut ulla ex rebus creatis. Opus est: sed non ut ullum ex operibus. Res condita est: sed non ut ulla ex rebus conditis*: “It is a

Augustin. in
Psalm. xlv.
[lv. 411.]

Athan. contra Arianos,
serm. 3. p.
178. [i. 486.]

creature : but not as any other of things created. It is a thing wrought : but not as any other thing that ever was wrought," &c.

But what saith Athanasius himself to all these phantasies ? His answer is this : *Jam videtis vafritiem et dolos istius hæreseos, quæ non ignara quam amarulenta sit ista sua malitia, fucos quærit, et lenocinium sibi mutuatur ex verborum disertitudine* : " Now ye see the crookedness and subtlety of this heresy, which knowing her own malice how bitter it is, borroweth some hue and colour by sleight of words."

Epist. Flavianus ad Leonem.
[Cotel. monum. i. p. 51.] inter Leon. Epist.

Thus Flavianus reproveth the heretic Eutyches : *Adjecit et aliam impietatem, dicens, corpus Domini, quod ex Maria factum est, non esse nostræ substantiæ* : " He added hereto another wickedness, saying that the body of Christ that was born of Mary is not now of our substance⁴⁰."

Leo de Resurrectione Domini, serm. i. [3. 305.]

Leo resolveth the matter thus : *Caro Christi ipsa est per essentiam : non ipsa per gloriam* : " The flesh of Christ in substance is now the same it was before : but in glory it is not the same⁴¹."

Augustin. ad Dardanum, epist. 57. [ii. 681.]

No man hereof writeth either more plainly or more directly than St. Augustine. His words be these : *Christus sic venturus est quemadmodum ire visus est in cælum, id est, in eadem carnis forma atque substantia : cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim ne ita divinitatem astruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus* : " Christ shall come again" (to judge) " even as he was seen going into heaven ; that is to say, in the selfsame form and substance of his flesh : unto which flesh undoubtedly he hath given immortality : but he hath not taken from it the nature of flesh. For we must take heed we do not so maintain the Godhead of Christ's humanity, that we deny the truth of his body."

⁴⁰ [Flavianus ad Leonem. Προσ-
ετίθει δὲ καὶ ἑτέραν δυσσεβειαν,
φάσκων τὸ ἐκ Μαρίας σῶμα γενό-
μενον τοῦ Κυρίου μὴ εἶναι τῆς ἡμε-
τέρας οὐσίας μηδὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου
φυράματος.]

⁴¹ [Leo de Resurr. Dom. i.

" Et merito dicitur caro Christi eo
" statu, quo fuerat nota, nesciri ;
" quia nihil in ea passibile, nihil
" remansit infirmum, ut et ipsa sit
" per essentiam, et non sit ipsa
" per gloriam."]

And where ye phantasy, that the body of Christ in the sacrament hath in itself neither form, nor proportion, nor limitation of place, nor distinction of parts, St. Augustine telleth you : *Spatia locorum tolle corporibus, et nusquam erunt : et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. Tolle ipsa corpora qualitativus corporum, non erit ubi sint, et ideo necesse est ut non sint* : “ Take away from bodies limitation of place, and the bodies will be nowhere : and because they be nowhere, they will be nothing. Take away from bodies the qualities of bodies, there will be no place for them to be in : and therefore the same bodies must needs be no bodies at all.”

Augustin. in eadem Epist. ad Dardanum. [ii. 683.]

Hereof we may conclude, that the body of Christ, which you have imagined to be contained grossly and carnally in the sacrament, forasmuch as by your own confession it hath neither quality, nor quantity, nor form, nor place, nor proportion of body, therefore by St. Augustine’s doctrine it is no body.

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding answereth : “ Bodies doubtless, left to their own common nature, have always the state that St. Augustine speaketh of in his epistle to Dardanus. But the precious body of Christ made present in the sacrament is not bound to that state or condition.”

M. Harding, p. 117.

The answer. O, M. Harding, when will you learn to deal plainly? what speak you so vainly of bodies left to their own common nature? Doth not St. Augustine in the same his epistle unto Dardanus speak namely and specially of the body of Christ? I mean of that most glorious body that is now in heaven above all powers and dominions, at the right hand of the Father. Doth not St. Augustine say of the selfsame body : *Huic corpori immortalitatem dedit : naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam Christus non est putandus ubique diffusus* ? “ Unto that same body of Christ God hath given immortality : yet hath he not taken from it the very nature of a body. After this form or proportion of body we may not think that Christ is extended or spread into all places?” Doth not St. Augustine in the selfsame place say of the selfsame most glorious body of Christ : *Christus Jesus ubique est per id quod Deus : in cælo autem per id quod homo* ? “ Christ Jesus is every-

Augustin. ad Dardanum Epist. [ii. 681.]

Addition.

De Consecra-
dist. 2. Pri-
ma.

where and in all places by way of his Godhead : and in heaven by way of his manhead⁴² ?” Or doth not St. Augustine say of the selfsame body, as he is alleged by Gratian : *Corpus Christi in quo resurrexit in uno loco esse oportet* ? “ The body of Christ wherein he rose again must needs be in one place ?” Is not this that body whereof Dardanus moved his question ? Is not this that body whereof St. Augustine maketh his answer ? or had he any cause to speak of any other body but only of this ?

“ But,” you say, “ the precious body of Christ made present in the sacrament is not bound to that condition.” These be your own phantasies, M. Harding, not the words of St. Augustine. For St. Augustine never told you of Christ’s body made present in the sacrament. But think you, or would you have your reader to think, that Christ hath such change of bodies, the one precious, the other not precious ? or that the blessed body of Christ is more precious and glorious in the sacrament than it is in heaven at the right hand of God ? O how much better were it for you to speak the truth, and to leave these fables ! Christ’s body doubtless is now most glorious, as being the body of the Son of God, indued with immortality, and full of glory : yet notwithstanding it is a body, and therefore in one place, as St. Augustine saith, and not in many. ➡

Here it is a world to see what pretty sport M. Harding maketh himself with the poor penman of this Apology. As God would, the simple body unawares alleged Fulgentius clean against himself. For the words of Fulgentius be these : *Christus, cum absit a nobis per formam servi, tamen semper est nobiscum per formam Dei* : “ Whereas Christ is absent from us by the form of a servant, yet is he evermore present with us by the form of God.” Whereby, saith M. Harding’s commentary, he meaneth that Christ is no more here among us in form and shape of man, in such wise as we see men live in the earth. “ And these words,” saith he, “ dash their whole purpose : and there-

⁴² [Here and elsewhere the word is printed *manhead* or *manhood*, according as it is spelt in the original edition. The truth is, that in bishop Jewel’s time the English language, with regard to many such words, was in a state of transition.]

fore the prelates of this new English church have altered the sense of them by shifting in this word 'manhood' instead of 'the form of a servant,' and this word 'Godhead' instead of 'the form of God.'"

I beseech thee, gentle reader, spare me a little thine indifferant ear, lest, in these misty clouds of M. Harding's distinctions, thou happen to wander and lose thy way. All this great ado ariseth only of some notable difference that is fancied to be between these two words, "form" and "substance." For M. Harding would fain have thee believe, that the substance of Christ's body is in many places, but the form of the same body can be only in one place, and not in many.

If I should demand, M. Harding, this question by the way, wherefore Christ's body in form may not as well be in many places together, as the same in substance: or how he knoweth it: or what doctor or father ever taught it: or how we may be well assured of it: perhaps he would take a day to consider it better. For thus a man might put him in mind of the grounds of his religion: Sir, ye know God is omnipotent, and his power infinite. Ye may not make him thrall and subject to your senses. That were natural reason: that were infidelity. Christ is as well able to dispose of the form of his body as of the substance: and can as well present the one in many places as the other. Howbeit, thus much only by the way.

Addition.

Addition. ¶ To reprove all that may be spoken in this behalf, M. Harding thus frameth his new objection: "The voice that is one in the origin, pronounced by one man, if you will believe Priscian that ancient learned grammarian, is a very body. And yet the selfsame one voice is driven into the ears of a thousand persons at once, as experience teacheth you by the common course of nature. And yet you will needs appoint the omnipotent power of God such limits as please you." *The answer.* Here, M. Harding, ye have broken St. Augustine's head⁴³ in favour of Priscian. But alas, what hard shift is this? what, should

M. Harding
p. 118 a.

⁴³ [That is, "your divinity is plied to those who write false false;" in allusion to the proverb, Latin.]
"Caput Prisciani diminuere," ap-

this poor silly grammarian be brought forth as a champion to prove matters in divinity? must St. Augustine, St. Hierom and St. Ambrose stand back, and give place unto Priscian: or if Priscian tell you that a voice is a body, will you believe him? Certainly, M. Harding, as the voice of a man is a body, so the light in the air, and the chirping of a sparrow, and the bleating of a sheep is a body, and your face in a glass is likewise a body. But Aristotle would have told you: *Sonus est qualitas sensibilis aëris*: “A voice or sound is a sensible quality of the air.” It is an accident, saith Aristotle, and not a body: in the predicament of quality, and not of substance. Thus ye confound nature, M. Harding, and build upon sand.

But you say, “Ye must send M. Jewel, being destitute of faith, unto Aristotle to learn wit of him.” God increase our faith, M. Harding, and supply that wanteth. I am not ashamed to learn wit either of Aristotle, or of any the meanest of God’s creatures. Balaam might have learned wit of his ass. But if yourself would go to Aristotle, and tell him that a voice is a body, that is to say, that an accident is a substance, I trow ye would not greatly commend your wisdom.

Howbeit, let a voice be a body, and, to please poor Priscian, let us refuse no absurdity nor repugnance in nature. Yet is your purpose never the nere⁴⁴. For the natural order of hearing standeth thus, as it is agreed by all philosophers. First the voice is a striking or beating of the air. Then the air so stricken, and proceeding from one mouth, as from the original, is multiplied forward by sundry circles, as we see rings multiplied in the water at the casting in of a stone, and by mean of the said circles the said voice is driven, and falleth into the ears of the hearers, and being but one at the first, by multiplication is made many. And to this purpose St. Augustine saith: *Sonus per moras temporum tendi et dividi potest*: “The sound or voice by leisure of time may be extended along, and divided into parts,” that is, to satisfy the sense of every hearer. Therefore, M. Harding, the voice being one at the first, and afterward by multiplication increasing, and

⁴⁴ [Nere—old English for nearer.]

falling into a thousand ears, is no more one voice in the end, than a thousand ears are one ear. For every ear receiveth severally his particular voice: and as many as be the ears hearing, so many in number be the voices.

These things, gentle reader, are true and certain, although perhaps unsavoury and dark unto the simple. But let M. Harding bear the blame hereof. For thus it pleased him to lay forth his philosophy out of grammarians, and to teach thee that a voice is a body, and to send us to Aristotle to learn wit. Verily it is but a simple kind of arguing to reason thus:

One voice may fall into many ears:

Ergo, the body of Christ hath not the proportion of a body. ☞

But now, what if all this great imagined difference be no difference? what if these two words “form” and “substance,” as they be used by Fulgentius, be all one? what then will M. Harding do with his pretty gloss?

Verily Athanasius saith thus: ^a *Natura, essentia, genus, forma unam sunt*: “Nature, substance, kind, and form be all one thing.” Leo saith: ^b *Quid est in forma Dei? In natura Dei*: “What is it to be in the form of God?” He answereth: “It is to be in the nature of God ⁴⁵.” Chrysostom saith: ^c *Forma Dei natura Dei est*: “The form of God is the nature of God.” St. Augustine saith: ^d *Secundum formam Dei Christus ipse de se loquitur: ego et Pater unum sumus* ⁴⁶: “As concerning the form of God, Christ himself saith of himself, I and my Father are both one.” Likewise again he saith: ^e *Una est forma, quia una est divinitas*: “The form is one because the Godhead is one.”

In like sort of the form of a servant: Leo saith: ^f *Quæro quid sit formam servi accipere? Sine dubio perfectionem naturæ et conditionis humanæ*: “What is it to take the form of a servant?” He answereth: “Doubtless it is to

⁴⁵ [Leo, epist. 97. Both this and the next quotation from Leo, are cited by that pope as extracts from St. Ambrose, ad Sabinum Episcop. The third chap. in the old ed. of epist. 97. begins the testimonies from the fathers to the

doctrines propounded by Leo in the first two chapters.]

⁴⁶ [The Serm. de Tempore 117. de Ascensione is of doubtful genuineness; but the same words are found in Johann. Evangel. tract. 78. tom. iii. pt. 2. p. 699.]

^a Athanas. de Definit. [ed. Basil. 1564. tom. iv. p. 29.]
^b Leo, epist. 97. cap. 3. [i. 708.]

^c Chrysost. ad Philippen. hom. 6. [xi. 234.]

^d Augustin. de Tempor. serm. 117. de Ascension. serm. 4. [v. app. 304.]
^e Augustin. epist. 177. [ii. 865.]

^f Leo, epist. 97. cap. 3. [i. 708.]

take the perfection of nature, and state of man." Chrysostom saith: ^g *Forma servi omnino est natura servi*: "The form of a servant verily is the nature of a servant." St. Augustine saith: ^h *Quando de forma servi in Christo cogitas, humanam effigiem cogita, si est in te fides*: "When thou thinkest of the form of a servant in Christ, think of the shape of a man, if there be any faith in thee." Again: ⁱ *Christum, secundum humanitatem, visibilem, corporeum, localem, atque omnia membra humana veraciter habentem credere convenit et confiteri*: "We must believe and confess that Christ according to his humanity is visible, hath the substance and properties of a body, is contained in place, and verily hath all the members, and the whole proportion of a man⁴⁷." To leave all others, Haimo saith: ^k *Formam servi accepit, id est, in veritate hominem accepit* [leg. *suscepit*]: "He took the form of a servant, that is to say, in very truth he took man."

Ye see, M. Harding, by these testimonies of the ancient learned fathers, far contrary to your vain distinction, that the "form" of God is nothing else but God: and the "form" of man is nothing else but man. Wherefore then have you thus devised us this new difference? wherefore say you of your own head, that "form" and "substance" be so contrary, seeing the catholic fathers say they be both one? or wherefore be you so busy to trouble the penman without cause? Certainly St. Augustine joineth "form" and "substance" both together, and by the one expoundeth the other: *In eadem forma atque substantia*: "In the same form and substance." And again expoundeth the same "form": *Veritatem corporis*: "The truth of a body."

By these it is plain that when Fulgentius saith, the "form" of God, he meaneth thereby the "substance," the "nature," and the "divinity" of God: and when he saith, the "form" of a servant, he meaneth likewise the "nature," the "substance," the "truth," the "perfection," and the "very manhood" of a man. And the whole drift of his discourse is this, that Christ being both God and man, by the nature and substance of his Godhead is every where:

g Chrysost.
ad Philip.
hom. 6. [xl.
234.]
h Augustin.
in Johan.
tract. 40. [iii.
pt. 2. §66.]

i Augustin.
de Essentia
Divinitatis.
[viii. app.
72.]

k Haimo in
Epist. ad
Philip. cap.
2.

Augustin. ad
Dardan.
epist. 57. [ii.
681.]

⁴⁷ [August. de Essentia Divinitatis. This work is spurious.]

but by the nature and substance of his manhood, and truth of his body, is only in one place, and not in mo: agreeing therein with these words of St. Augustine before rehearsed:

Corpus in quo resurrexit in uno loco esse oportet: “The body wherein he rose again must needs be in one place.” De Consecra-
dist. 2. Pri-
ma.

As for real or bodily presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, or the body of Christ without form or proportion of a body, this learned father Fulgentius writeth nothing. Neither was there any such phantasy in those days in the church of God.

Here are we terribly charged with guileful dealing, with a special note also in the margin: “Fulgentius foully falsified.” We have shifted in this word “manhead,” instead of “the form of a servant:” and this word “Godhead,” instead of “the form of God.” And therefore both the penman and the prelates of our new clergy must needs be brought forth before the bar.

I will not here tell you, M. Harding, how lewdly ye have demeaned yourself towards her whom it liketh you so often and so scornfully to call the lady interpreter⁴⁸: a lady, I will not say of what learning, virtue, and gravity, but certainly as far from all unwomanly presumption, wherewith ye so rudely touch her, as you are from all manly modesty: and, for ought that may appear by these toys and trifles ye have sent us over, as full of wisdom as you of folly.

But the prelates of this new clergy, you say, have foully falsified both the words and the sense of Fulgentius. And wherein, M. Harding? Forsooth instead of these words, “the form of man” and “the form of God,” for the better understanding of the unlearned, they have used these words, as more commonly known, “Godhead” and “manhead.” If this be so foul a fault, wherefore then is the old father and martyr Vigilius suffered thus to say: *Dei filius secundum humanitatem suam recessit a nobis: secundum divinitatem suam semper est nobiscum*? “The Son of God

Vigilius,
[Taps.] lib.
1. contra
Eutychetem.
[Bibl. Patr.
viii. 723. F.]

⁴⁸ [The Apology was translated into English by the lady Anne Bacon, the wife of sir Nicholas Bacon, lord keeper of the great seal, and mother of the renowned

lord Bacon. Bishop Jewel could not have paid a higher compliment to its faithfulness, than by making that version the text-book of his “Defence.”]

[Ibid. lib. 4.
tom. viii.
733. D.]

according to his manhead is departed from us : according to his Godhead is ever with us ?” Or again : *Christus est ubique secundum naturam divinitatis suæ : et loco continetur secundum naturam humanitatis suæ* : “ Christ is in all places according to the nature of his Godhead : and is contained in one place according to the nature of his manhead.”

Cyrril, in
Johan. lib. 9.
cap. 21. [iv.
973.]

Wherefore doth Cyrrillus say : *Secundum carnem solam abiturus erat : adest autem semper virtute deitatis ?* “ According to the flesh only he would depart : but by the power of his Godhead he is ever present ?” Wherefore doth

Gregor. hom.
30. in die
Pentecost.
[i. 1576.]

Gregory say : *Verbum incarnatum manet et recedit : manet divinitate, recedit corpore ?* “ The word incarnate both abideth with us, and departeth from us : it abideth with us by the Godhead : it departeth from us by the body (or manhead.)” Wherefore doth St. Augustine say : *Ibat per id quod homo erat : manebat per id quod Deus erat. Ibat per id quod uno loco erat : manebat per id quod ubique erat ?* “ Christ departed by that he was man : and abode by that he was God. He departed by that that was in ‘ one place :’ he abode by that that is in all places.”

Augustin, in
Johan. tract.
78. [iii. pt. 2.
698.]

If ye will yet stand in doubt what these holy fathers meant by the manhead of Christ that departed from us, let St. Augustine open both his own and their meanings. Thus he writeth in express and plain words touching the

Augustin, in
Johan. tract.
50. [iii. pt. 2.
634.]

same : *Secundum carnem quam verbum assumpsit : secundum id quod de virgine natus est : secundum id quod a Judæis prehensus est : quod ligno confixus : quod de cruce depositus : quod linteis involutus : quod in sepulchro conditus : quod in resurrectione manifestatus, Me non semper habebitis vobiscum* : “ According to the flesh that the Word received, according to that he was born of the Virgin : according to that he was taken of the Jews : according to that he was nailed to the tree, taken down from the cross, lapt in a sheet, laid in the grave, and was declared in his resurrection,” (these words are true,) “ Ye shall not have me always with you.” Likewise again he saith : *Dominus noster absentavit se corpore ab omni ecclesia, et ascendit in cælum.....* : “ Our Lord, as touching his body, absented himself from his whole church, and ascended into heaven.”

Augustin, in
Serm. in
feri. 2. Pasch.
[leg. feri. 6.
v. 990.]

To be short, if it be so heinous an error in this case to

use these words "Godhead" and "manhead," wherefore is not Fulgentius himself reproved for so often using the same? These be his words: *Secundum humanitatem suam localiter erat in terra: secundum divinitatem.....et cælum implevit et terram.*—*Vera humanitas Christi localis est: vera divinitas semper immensa est.*—*Caro Christi absque dubitatione localis est: divinitas tamen ejus ubique semper est.*—*Permansit in Christo immensa divinitas: suscepta est ab eo localis humanitas.*—*Quomodo ascendit in cælum,* [p. 173.] *nisi quia localis et verus est homo? Quomodo adest fidelibus, nisi quia idem immensus et verus est Deus?* "Christ according to his manhood was placed in earth: but according to his Godhead he filled both heaven and earth. The manhood of Christ is contained in place: the Godhead of Christ is infinite, and in all places. The flesh of Christ is doubtless in (one) place: the Godhead of Christ is for ever in every place. There remained still in Christ the infinite Godhead: there was received of him a local manhood. How ascended he into heaven, saving that he is very man contained in place? how is he present with the faithful, saving that he is infinite and true God?" Last of all he saith: *Unus idemque Christus secundum humanam substantiam aberat cælo cum esset in terra, et dereliquit terram cum ascendisset in cælum:* "Christ being one, according to the substance of his manhood, was absent from heaven when he was in earth, and forsook the earth when he ascended into heaven."

Fulgentius ad
Regem Thra-
symon. lib.
2. [cap. 17.
p. 173.]

[lib. 2. cap.
17. p. 172.]

Thus many times, M. Harding, ye have these words in one place together in Fulgentius himself: "the Godhead," "the manhood:" "very God," "very man:" the "flesh of Christ," the "substance of the manhood." And these be the selfsame words that you reprove.

Blot out therefore for shame that unadvised note in your margin. Look better to your book. Work hereafter more discretely, and trouble not neither penmen nor others without cause. Otherwise the penman will tell you what bird bare the feather that made you a pen.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 1. Divis. 2.

We believe that the Holy Ghost, who is the third ^[Vol. iv. p. 16.] person in the holy Trinity, is very God : not made, not created, not begotten, but proceeding from both the Father and the Son by a certain mean unknown unto man, and unspeakable : and that it is his property to mollify and soften the hardness of man's heart, when he is once received thereinto, either by the wholesome preaching of the gospel, or by any other way : that he doth give men light, and guide them unto the knowledge of God : to all way of truth : to newness of the whole life : and to everlasting hope of salvation.

M. HARDING.

As we acknowledge this article to be true and catholic, so we demand of these defenders how they can prove the same. Have they either express scripture for it, or any of the four first general councils, which be esteemed of most authority ? ^a We are sure they have not. Therefore we do them to understand, and, if they hear us not, we advertise the readers that fear God and love his truth, that all truth necessarily to be believed is not ^b expressed in the scripture : and that ^b other councils be to be received besides the four first, which are allowed in England by parliament⁴⁹.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Consider, M. Harding, notwithstanding ye evermore tell us of fathers, fathers, yet how contrary oftentimes ye are in judgment to the same fathers. You say, as here we may gather by your words, that the Godhead of the Holy Ghost cannot be proved by express words of the scriptures : and thereof, ye say, ye are right sure. Yet St. Augustine nothing doubteth but it may well be proved by plain scriptures. Thus he saith : *Spiritus Sanctus est Deus. Unde Petrus cum dixisset, Ausus es mentiri Spiritui Sancto,*

^a Untruth !
as shall appear.

^b O folly.
Who ever
said otherwise ?

Augustin.
contra literas
Petiliani,
lib. 3. cap.
48. [ix. 326.]

⁴⁹ [Harding goes on to speak "whence this point touching the proceeding of the Holy Ghost hath been defined."]

continuo sequutus adjunxit quid esset Spiritus Sanctus, et ait, Non es mentitus hominibus, sed Deo : “The Holy Ghost is God. Therefore Peter when he had said” (unto Ananias), “Thou hast enterprised to lie to the Holy Ghost, he followed readily, and told him what was the Holy Ghost, and said, Thou hast not lied unto man, but unto God.”

Again he saith: *Ostendit Paulus Deum esse Spiritum Sanctum, et ideo non esse creaturam :* “St. Paul sheweth us that the Holy Ghost is God, and therefore is no creature.” Likewise again he saith: *Ne quisquam Spiritum Sanctum negaret Deum, continuo sequutus ait, Glorificate et portate Deum in corpore vestro :* “Lest any man should deny that the Holy Ghost is God, Paul added immediately these words: Glorify you therefore and bear God in your body.” Here have we St. Augustine’s yea, and M. Harding’s nay. St. Augustine assureth us he hath scriptures to prove the Godhead of the Holy Ghost: M. Harding saith, we are sure he hath none at all. Judge thou now, gentle reader, whether of these doctors thou wilt believe.

But what a vain vanity and folly is this? will M. Harding have us believe that God cannot be God unless he be allowed by the church of Rome, and by the pope? Then are we come again to that that Tertullian writeth merrily of the heathens: *Nisi homini Deus placuerit, Deus non erit.* Tertull. in Apologetico. [cap. 5. p. 6.] *Homo jam Deo propitius esse debet :* “Unless God please man well” (though he be God) “he shall be no God. And so now man must be friendly and favourable unto God.”

We believe, M. Harding, that the Holy Ghost is very God indeed, not upon the pope’s or his clergy’s credit, but, as St. Augustine saith, upon the special warrant of the word of God.

And therefore Nazianzen saith: *Dicet aliquis non esse scriptum Spiritum Sanctum esse Deum. Atqui proponetur tibi examen testimoniorum, ex quibus ostendetur divinitatem Sancti Spiritus testatam esse in sacris literis, nisi quis valde insulsus sit, et alienus a Spiritu Sancto :* Nazianzen. de Spiritu Sancto. [l. 574.] ὅτι καὶ λαὸν ἑγγραφὸς ἡ τοῦ πνεύματος θεότης ἐπιδειχθήσεται. “Some men will say, It is not written that the Holy Ghost is God. But I will bring thee forth a whole swarm of authorities, whereby it shall well appear that the Godhead of the Holy Ghost is

plainly witnessed in the holy scriptures, unless a man be very dull, and utterly void of the Holy Ghost⁵⁰.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. *Divis. 1.*

We believe that there is one church of God, and that the same is not shut up (as in times past among the Jews) into some one corner or kingdom, but that it is catholic and universal, and dispersed throughout the whole world. So that there is now no nation which may truly complain that they be shut forth, and may not be one of the church and people of God: and that this church is the kingdom, the body, and the spouse of Christ: that Christ alone is the Prince of this kingdom: that Christ alone is the Head of this body: and that Christ alone is the Bridegroom of this spouse.

M. HARDING.

It is a world to see these defenders: they, which have not kept unity of spirit in the bond of charity, which St. Paul requireth, Ephes. iv. 3. but have severed themselves from the body of the church, tell us now forsooth, they believe that there is one church of God. But what may we think this one church to be? can they seem to mean any other (whatsoever they pretend) than this new church of late years set up by Satan through the ministry of Martin Luther and those other apostates his companions, if it may be named a church, and not rather a Babylonical tower? For as touching that church, whereof ^aall Christian people hath ever taken the successor of Peter to be the head under Christ, which is the true catholic church, in their Apology they stick not to say plainly that it is clean fallen down long ago. And therefore the beginning of Luther's seditions and heretical preaching they call *herbam*, as much to say, as the green grass, or first spring (this interpreter nameth it the very first appearing) of the gospel, leaf F. 7. And in the leaf F. 8, they say that forty years ago and upward, that is, at the first setting forth of Luther and Zuinglius, the truth was unknown and unheard of: and that they first came to the knowledge and preaching of the gospel. Likewise in another place they grant that certain and

^a Untruth. For the fathers in the primitive church never took him so.

Look in the leaf H. 7. b. Leaf E. 2. In Latin they term it, *exortum evangelii*.

⁵⁰ [Nazianz. de Spirit. Sanct. φων υποθέμενος. ἤδη δὲ ἤξει σοι ταῦτα μὲν οὖν εἶποι τὶς ἂν τὸ ἄγρα- καὶ ὁ τῶν μαρτυριῶν ἕρμους, κ.τ.λ.]

very strange sects have been stirring in the world ever since the gospel did spring, meaning the time when Luther first brinced to Germany the poisoned cup of his heresies, blasphemies, and Satanisms.

Thus having condemned the church of God, which was before Luther's time, and allowing that for the true church, the gospel whereof first sprang out of Luther: how can they avouch their belief, and by what reason and learning can they make good, that there is one church of God? We would fain know which and where it is. Is Luther and his congregation that one church of God, or Zuinglius and his rabble, or Osiander and his sort, or Zuenckfeldius and his sect, or Stancarus and his band, or Balthasar Pacimontane and his rank? For all these, and certain other sects, have ^bLuther for their founder, and for their Radix Jesse, as it were, from whence they spring. And indeed every learned man easily seeth how the gutters of their doctrines run out of Luther's sink. Of all these there is none but stoutly claimeth the name of the church.

^b Untruth.
As shall appear.

Then how say ye, defenders, which church be ye? Name the child. If ye name one, we set the others against you, &c.

How often in his books putteth Luther you and your captains in the roll of those that he utterly condemneth, naming roundly together, infidels, Turks, epicures, heretics, papists, sacramentaries? And now if he should hear you challenge the name of the one church of God to you, and deny him and his followers that claimed title: would he not, think ye, stamp and rage, would he not whet his dog-eloquence upon you, and call you worse than these above reckoned, yea, and, if he wist how, worse than some of you be yourselves? The like courtesy may ye look for at those other sects, of which every one claimeth the name of this one church of God.

But ye say that this one church is not shut up into some one corner or kingdom, but that it is catholic and universal, and dispersed throughout the whole world. True it is that ye say, whatsoever ye think. But the holy learned and ancient fathers, where they call and believe the catholic church, they mean, as Vincentius Lirinensis declareth, the church to be catholic, that is to say, "universal," (for so the word signifieth,) in respect of a threefold universality: of places, which this defender here toucheth: of times and of men, which he toucheth not. "In the catholic church we must have a great care," saith he, "that we hold that which hath every where, evermore, and of all persons been believed." If these defenders prove not the church they profess themselves to be of to have this threefold universality, then is their congregation not this one church, nor of this one church of God, but the synagogue of Antichrist.

And although the authors of this Apology crake of the great increase and spreading abroad of their gospel, and now glory in the number of kingdoms, dukedoms, countries, commonweals,

Catholic church.

Why is the church called catholic?

and free cities : yet hath it not gone so far abroad as the Arians' heresy did, by three parts of four : which was at length utterly extinguished, as this shall be.

That the catholic church is the kingdom, the body, and the spouse of Christ, we acknowledge. Of the same kingdom we confess and believe Christ to be Prince alone, so as he is Head of this body alone, and so as he is Bridegroom of this spouse alone. For Head and Spouse alone he is in one respect, not alone in another respect. According to the inward influence of grace, Christ properly and only is Head of his mystical body the church : but as touching the outward government, the being of a Head is common to Christ with others. For in this respect certain others may be called heads of the church, as in Amos the prophet, the great states be called the heads of the people. So the scripture speaketh of king Saul : " When thou wert a little one in thine own eyes, thou wast made head among the tribes of Israel." So David saith of himself : " He hath made me head of

Christ alone
Prince, Head,
Bridegroom,
Spouse of
the church.

Amos vi. 1.
1 Sam. xvi. 17.
Psalms xviii.
43.

Men be called heads, inasmuch as they be instead of Christ, and under Christ : after which meaning St. Paul saith to the Corinthians : " For if I forgave any thing, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it, *in persona Christi*, ' in the person of Christ.' " And in another place : " We are ambassadors instead of Christ, even as though God did exhort you through us." To conclude in few, according to inward influence of grace into every faithful member, Christ only is Head of the church, according to outward governing, the pope under Christ, and instead of Christ, is head of the same.

2 Cor. ii. 10.
2 Cor. v. 20.

c Untruth.
What scripture or doctrine ever said so ?

As touching the Bridegroomship, we say and believe, that if we would speak properly, Christ is the only Bridegroom of the church his spouse, of whom it is said, he that hath a spouse is a bridegroom. For from out of the church he begetteth children to himself. But others are called bridegrooms working together with Christ outwardly to the begetting of spiritual children, whom nevertheless they beget not to themselves, but to Christ. And such are called the ministers of the Bridegroom, inasmuch as they do his stead. And therefore the pope who is instead of Christ the bridegroom of the whole church, is called also the bridegroom of the universal church. A man may term him the vicegerent bridegroom.

Christ the true Bridegroom, the pope under bridegroom of the church.
John iii. 29.

d Untruth.
For the ancient fathers never called him so.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I trust, gentle reader, thou wilt not look I should answer all M. Harding's ordinary idle talk. So should I lose good time without cause, and be overtroublesome to thine ears. " Oh," saith he, " what a world it is to see these defenders ! They which have not kept the unity of the

Spirit in the bond of charity, which St. Paul requireth, but have severed themselves from the body of the church, tell us now forsooth, that they believe that there is one church of God." O, M. Harding, if we have herein said ill, then bear witness of the ill. If we have said well, wherefore make you these bitter outcries? whatsoever ye have conceived us to be, yet might ye suffer us quietly to say the truth, specially such truth as you imagine maketh so much for yourself.

Ye say we confess that our church began only about forty years sithence, and was never before. No, M. Harding, we confess it not: and you yourself well know we confess it not. It is your tale: it is not ours. We say, and have sufficiently proved, and you know it right well, if ye would be known of that ye know, that our doctrine is the old, and yours is the new. If ye will needs force yourself to the denial, it may easily be proved, and that by such authority as yourself may not well deny, unless ye will once again do now as ye have twice done before.

We say that our doctrine, and the order of our churches, is elder than yours by five hundred whole years and more. If ye will not believe us, yet believe M. Harding: he will tell you even the same. Mark well his words: these they be: "It standeth not with Christ his promises made to the church, that he should suffer his church to continue in darkness these thousand years past."

M. Harding,
[Confut.]
fol. 15 a.

And thus by secret confession he leaveth us five hundred threescore and six whole years at the least: that is to say, the whole time of Christ, of his apostles, and of all the godly learned doctors and fathers of the primitive church. Which time notwithstanding is thought a great deal better and purer than all the time that hath followed afterward. In this division M. Harding being attent and eager upon his cause, and claiming as much as he thought with any modesty he might be able, hath claimed to himself only a thousand years of the night: and hath left us well near six hundred years of the day.

This is your own witness, M. Harding. Consider well of it. It is your own. Therefore ye do yourself great

wrong, and much deface your own credit so suddenly to say our doctrine is new. God's name be blessed, it hath the testimony, not only of Christ and his apostles, but also of the old learned catholic fathers of the church. And this is it that so much grieveth you, that we reform our churches now according to the pattern and sampler of Christ's and his apostles' first institution. For thereby the disorder and deformity of your churches the more appeareth.

Vincentius
Lirinensis.

Lirinensis saith: "That thing must be holden for catholic, that every where, evermore, and of all men hath been believed." These general notes must be limited with this special restraint: "Whereas the churches were not corrupted." For otherwise there was never any doctrine so catholic, no not the confessed doctrine of Christ himself, that hath been received "evermore," and "every where," and "of all men," without any exception. For the Turks receive it not, and the Jews abhor it. And so the very gospel of Christ itself by this rule should not be catholic. But, M. Harding, these selfsame notes of Lirinensis utterly overthrow the greatest part of that whole doctrine that you would so fain have counted catholic. For neither reacheth it within five hundred years of the apostles' time, nor hath it that antiquity indeed that in face and countenance is pretended, as it is plain by your own former confession: nor was it ever universally received, as hereafter by particulars it shall be proved. It had never that universality, neither of all times and ages, nor of all places and countries: nor was it ever universally received and allowed of all men. Therefore whatsoever ye call it, ye cannot by your own definition call it catholic.

The catholic church of God standeth not in multitude of persons, but in weight of truth. Otherwise Christ himself and his apostles had not been catholic. For his flock was very little: and the catholic or universal consent of the world stood against it. The church of God is compared to the moon, for that she waxeth and waneth as the moon doth, and sometime is full, sometime is empty: and therefore, as St. Augustine saith, is called *catholica, quia universaliter perfecta est, et in nullo claudicat, et per totum*

Augustin. de
Gen. ad li-
ter. cap. 1.
[iii. 94.]

orbem diffusa est: “because she is universally perfect, and halteth in nothing, and is” (not now shut up in one only country, as was the church of the Jews, but) “poured throughout the whole world.” Though the hearts of men have often changes, yet God’s truth is evermore one: and, be it in many, or in few, is ever catholic. Thus, M. Harding, it is written by one of your own side: *Etsi non nisi duo viri fideles remanerent in mundo, tamen in eis salvaretur ecclesia, quæ est unitas fidelium*: “Although there were but two faithful men remaining in the world, yet even in them two the church, which is the unity of the faithful, should be saved.”

Fortalitium
Fidei, lib. 5.
[fol. cccxi.]

Addition.

Addition. ¶ Some say, that at the time of Christ’s passion, the whole faith remained only in the blessed Virgin our lady: and that even now the same faith may be so straited, that it may rest only in one poor old woman. Which thing if it should happen, yet should not God’s truth therefore wander about the world, as it liketh you to jest: *tanquam accidens sine subjecto*. The prophet Osee saith: “There is no truth, there is no mercy, there is no knowledge of God in the earth.” Yet notwithstanding the prophet David saith: “The truth of God endureth for ever.” “God is true, though all men be false.” His truth is a substance, and standeth mightily as the heavens: it wandereth not vainly as an accident. ¶

Æneas Sylvius de gestis
concilii Basiliensis, lib. 1.
[p. 9 c.]

M. Harding,
p. 126 a.
Hosea iv. 1.

Psal. cxvii. 2.
Rom. iii. 4.

Luther’s dog-eloquence, (for so, M. Harding, it liketh you of your modesty to call it,) were it never so rough and vehement, the just zeal of God’s glory, and of his holy temple, which you so miserably had defaced, so enforcing him, yet was it never any thing comparable to your eloquence. For, I beseech you, if ye may have leisure, hearken a little, and hear yourself talk. Behold your own words, so many, so vain, so bitter, so fiery, so furious, all together in one place: “This new church,” ye say, “set up by Satan:” “Martin Luther and other apostates his companions:” “this Babylonical tower:” “Luther’s seditious and heretical preaching:” “Luther brinced to Germany the poisoned cup of his heresies, blasphemies, and satanisms:” “Zuinglius and his rabble:” “the gutters of

this doctrine run out of Luther's sink : " Luther would stamp and rage, and whet his dog-eloquence upon you : " " you are the synagogue of Antichrist. " These be the figures and flowers of your speech. Yet must we think that ye can neither stamp nor rage, but use only angels' eloquence. Howbeit, I trust, no wise man will judge our cause the worse, for that your tongue can so readily serve to speak ill.

To the matter. Ye say, that touching the influence of grace, Christ is the head of the church : but touching direction and government, the pope only is the head. All this is but your own tale, M. Harding : ye speak it only of yourself. Other authority of scripture or doctor ye bring us none.

M. Harding,
p. 131 a.

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding allegeth sundry authorities to prove the universal supremacy of the pope. Chrysostom, saith he, writeth thus : " Peter being a fisher, is the head and feeder of the church. " And again : " Peter was the master of the world. " And again : " Christ made Peter ruler over all the world. " In the end, he concludeth with good liking of his case, and saith : " How say you, are ye contented now ? " *The answer.* No doubt, M. Harding : otherwise, I trow, I were to blame. For here have you brought us great and worthy speeches of St. Peter : of whose authority we moved no question. But ye bring us not one word of the pope. If every word spoken to Peter should be applied unto the pope, then should the pope be

Matt. xvi. 23. called Satan : for so Christ called Peter.

Neither do these words here alleged prove of necessity, that Peter himself was the head and ruler of all the world. For you may find the same words applied as well to St. James, to St. Paul, and to sundry other holy fathers⁴⁶.

† Clemens,
epist. i.
[Mansi tom.
i. 91.]

Clemens saith thus : " I send greeting unto James, the brother of our Lord, and the bishop of bishops, governor of the holy church of the Jews at Jerusalem, and also of all the churches that by God's providence are every where founded. " Here St. James is head of all churches what-

soever. Likewise Chrysostom writeth of St. Paul: "The nation of the Jews was committed to Michael. But both land and sea, and the habitation of all the world, is committed to St. Paul." Likewise St. Gregory saith: "Paul had the princehood of all the whole church⁴⁷." So St. Hierom calleth Origen: *Magistrum ecclesiarum*: "The master and teacher of the churches." And in like manner Theodoretus calleth St. Chrysostom: *Doctorem orbis terrarum*: "The teacher and instructor of all the world." Yet neither James, nor Paul, nor Origen, nor Chrysostom, were bishops of Rome, nor had they that power that by these words is pretended.

It is great folly to claim the pope's authority by such general words, as may be common to so many. ➡

Ye say, St. Paul saith: "If I forgave any thing, for your sakes I forgave it, in the person of Christ:" "we are ambassadors in the stead of Christ, even as though God did exhort you through us." Hereof ye conclude: *ergo*, "The pope under Christ, and instead of Christ, is head of the church." If ye conclude not thus, ye wander idly, and speak in vain, and conclude nothing. These words of St. Paul nothing touch the pope, but only the faithful and zealous preacher of the gospel. For wherein doth the pope resemble St. Paul? wherein doth he represent the person of Christ? what exhorteth he? what teacheth he? what saith he? what doth he? and yet, if he would do any one part of his whole duty, how might this argument stand for good? St. Paul, being at the city of Philippi in Macedonia, exhorted the Corinthians as in the person of Christ: *ergo*, the pope, being at Rome in Italy, although he neither exhort nor preach, yet is he the head of the universal church. Although divinity go hard with you, yet ye should have seen better to your logic.

I grant, bishops may be called the heads of their several churches. So Chrysostom calleth ^a Elias: *Caput prophetarum*: "The head of the prophets;" so Amos saith: "The princes are the heads of the people;" so Saul is

Chrysost. in Act. [leg. de laudibus Pauli.] hom. 3. [ii. 486.]

Gregor. in r. Reg. lib. 4. cap. 5. [iii. pt. 2. 250.]

Hieronym. de locis Hebræicis. [li. 3.]

Theodoret. lib. 5. cap. 32. [iii. p. 232.]

^a Chrysost. in Epist. ad Rom. hom. 18. [ix. 636.]
^b Amos vi. 1.

⁴⁷ [Gregor. in Libb. Reg. The genuineness of this work is doubted of.]

c 1 Sam. xv.
17.
d Psal. xviii.
43.
e Articul. 4.
Divis. 32.
[supra, vol.
ii. 308.]
f 1 Concil.
[ed. Suri] in
Ephes. Sy-
nod. epist. 5.
[tom. i. 689.]
g Gregor. in
1 Reg. lib. 4.
cap. 5. [iii.
pt. 2. p. 250.]
h Prudentius
in Enchiri-
dio, [Dip-
tych. 26.]
i Optatus,
lib. 1. [cap.
13.] et 2.
[cap. 24.]

k Augustin.
contra Liter.
Petil. lib. 1.
cap. 5. [ix.
208.]
l Gregor. lib.
4. epist. 38.
[li. 743.]

Peter was a
member of
the church
but not the
head.

called : “^c The head of the tribes of Israel ;” so David was made ^d *caput gentium*, “the head of nations.” Sundry such other like examples I alleged in my former ^e Reply to M. Harding : as that Cyrillus the bishop of Alexandria, in the council of Ephesus was called ^f *Caput episcoporum congregatorum* : “The head of the bishops that there were assembled :” that St. Gregory saith : ^g *Paulus, ad Christum conversus, caput effectus est nationum* : “Paul, being once converted to Christ, was made the head of nations :” that Prudentius saith : ^h *Sancta Bethlem caput est orbis* : “Holy Bethlem is the head of the world.” In this sense Optatus saith : “ⁱ There be four sorts of heads in the church, the bishops, the priests, the deacons, the faithful.” And all this only in a certain kind of phrase and manner of speech. But indeed and verily St. Augustine saith : ^k *Paulus ipse non poterat caput esse eorum, quos plantaverat* : “Paul himself could not be the head of them whom he had planted.” Therefore Gregory saith : ^l *Petrus apostolus primum membrum sanctæ et universalis ecclesiæ est. Paulus, Andreas, Joannes, quid aliud, quam singularium sunt plebium capita ? tamen, sub uno capite, omnes membra sunt ecclesiæ. Atque, ut cuncta brevi cingulo loquutionis astringam, sancti ante legem, sancti in lege, sancti sub gratia : omnes hi perficientes corpus Domini in membris sunt ecclesiæ constituti. Et nemo se unquam universalem vocari voluit* : “Peter the apostle is” (not the head, but) “the chief member of the holy universal church. Paul, Andrew, and John, what are they else, but the heads of several nations ? yet notwithstanding under one Head” (Christ), “they are all members of the church. And to speak shortly, the saints before the law, the saints in the law, the saints in the time of grace, all accomplishing the Lord’s body, are placed amongst the members of the church. And there was never yet one that would have himself called the universal bishop.” Therefore, whereas M. Harding saith, All Christian people have ever taken the successor of Peter to be the head of the catholic church under Christ, he speaketh it only of himself. And though

mendacium, ex propriis loquitur: “When he speaketh untruth, he speaketh it of his own.” St. Gregory saith: “Peter was the chief member of the church of Christ:” but not the head.

But the bishop of Rome, and his hired proctors, have taught us far otherwise. Panormitane saith: *Christus et papa faciunt unum consistorium: et, excepto peccato, potest papa quasi omnia facere, quæ potest Deus*: “Christ and the pope make one consistory, and keep one court: and, sin only excepted, the pope in a manner can do all things that God can do⁴⁸.” This, I trow, is that head of direction and government that M. Harding meaneth.

As for the rest, that the church is the kingdom of Christ, and the pope the prince thereof, M. Harding in special words answereth nothing. Notwithstanding, some others have said: *Petro et cælestis et terreni imperii jura commissa [a Deo] sunt*: “Unto Peter was committed the right both of the heavenly, and also of the earthly empire.”

Last of all he doubteth not, but the pope may be called the spouse or bridegroom of the universal church: and yet the same without the authority of any doctor. He allegeth only St. Bernard: but the same St. Bernard in the selfsame place saith, and that by M. Harding’s own confession, that the pope is not the bridegroom of the church. And therefore he was fain to expound his meaning, and to weigh him down of the other side with his pretty gloss. But St. Bernard without gloss saith plainly: *Non sunt omnes amici sponsi, qui hodie sunt sponsi ecclesiæ*: “They be not all the bridegroom’s friends, that are this day the spouses of the church.” *O miserandam sponsam talibus creditam paranympis! Non amici sponsi, sed æmuli sunt.* “O miserable is that spouse, that is committed to such leaders! They are not the friends, they are the enemies, of the bridegroom.”

Howbeit, we need not greatly to reckon what styles and

⁴⁸ [Panormitane quotes these exact words, as from Hostiensis de Transl. Episc. c. Quanto. See infra, part 5. cap. 6. div. 6. [p. 472, ed. 1609.] where bishop Jewel justifies himself from Harding’s accusation that he had falsified Hostiensis.]

De Electione
ca. Licet.
Abb. [in De-
cretal. tom.
1. fol. 123.
col. 4 f.]

Extra, lib. ii.
Novit ille,
in Gloss.

Bernard, in
concil. Re-
mensi.

Bernard, ad
Fulgent. de
Considera.
lib. 3. [cap.
5. ii. 442.]

titles the pope can vouchsafe to allow himself. As he may be called the head, the prince, and the spouse : even so, and by like authority and truth, may he be called the light, the life, the Saviour, and the God of the church.

God give him an heart to understand, that he may be, although not the head, yet a member of that body : although not the prince, yet a subject in that kingdom : although not the bridegroom, yet a child, of the church of God.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 3. Divis. 1.*

Furthermore, we believe that there be divers ^[Vol. iv. p. 17.] degrees of ministers in the church : whereof some be deacons, some priests, some bishops : to whom is committed the office to instruct the people, and the whole charge and setting forth of religion.

M. HARDING.

Here it had been your part to have declared your faith touching the holy sacrament of order, agreeable to the faith of the catholic church : that there be seven orders of the church, four lesser, and three greater : for so by good reason they are called. And as for the institution, authority, and estimation of the greater, specially of priesthood and deaconship, ye might have alleged the scriptures : so for the lesser, the example of Christ, the tradition of the apostles, and the testimonies written of the apostles' scholars, of those that both next and soon after followed them, namely, Dionys. cap. 3. Hierarch. Ecclesiast. : Ignatius, epist. 8. ad Ecclesiam Antiochenam : Tertull. in Præscript. Adversus Hæreticos : Gaius pope and martyr in Diocletian's time : Zosimus in St. Augustine's time : Hesychius : Eusebius Cæsariensis in his Ecclesiastical History : and Epiphanius in the end of his book, Contra Hæreses.

Untruths
boldly pre-
sumed, as by
the answer it
may appear.

Sacrament
of Order.
By good
reason.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Gentle reader, if I should leave these, and other like M. Harding's words unanswered, thou mightest haply think he had said somewhat. Here he saith, it had been our part to have told thee of seven orders in the church, three greater and four less : having indeed himself clean forgotten his own part. For, notwithstanding this controlment and account of so many orders, yet he nameth no

more orders than we have named. And verily, if he would have followed his own authorities, it had been hard for him in any good order to have made up his own account.

For his own Anacletus saith (I call him his own, for that it is only a forged pamphlet, never written by that holy father Anacletus, as it is easy to be seen): but whatsoever he were, thus he saith: *Amplius quam isti duo ordines sacerdotum (episcopi et presbyteri) nec nobis a Deo collati sunt, nec apostoli docuerunt*: “More than these two orders of priests (bishops and elders) neither hath God appointed us, nor have the apostles taught us.” And yet of these same two several orders St. Hierom seemeth to make only one order. For thus he writeth: *Audio quendam in tantam erupisse vecordiam, ut diaconos presbyteris, id est, episcopis anteferet*: “I hear say there is a man broken out unto such wilful fury, that he placeth deacons before priests, that is to say, before bishops.” And again: *Apostolus præcipue docet eosdem esse presbyteros quos episcopos*: “The apostle” (Paul) “specially teacheth us that priests and bishops be all one⁴⁹.” The same St. Hierom, writing upon the prophet Esay, reckoneth only five orders or degrees in the whole church: the bishops, the priests, the deacons, the enterers or beginners, and the faithful. And other order of the church he knoweth none.

† Anaclet.
epist. 3.
[Mansi i.
616.]

Hieronym.
ad Evange-
lum. [iv. l. t.
2. 802.]

Hieronym.
in eadem E-
pistol. [ib.]

Hieronym.
in Esai. lib.
5. cap. 19.
[iii. 131.]
Catechu-
meni.

Addition. ¶ As for M. Harding's pretty imaginations of terms general, and terms special, they are mere vanities, not worth the hearing. For St. Hierom's words be plain enough: “A priest and a bishop is all one thing: and

Hieronym.
ad Titum,
cap. 1. [iv.
413.]

⁴⁹ [The inconclusiveness of St. Jerome's reasoning in support of his theory of the original equality of bishops and priests, has been well shewn by archbishop Potter in the 4th chapter of his Discourse on Church Government. It must be remembered also, that even St. Jerome excepts ordination as the prerogative of bishops, and moreover that he traces the distinction between the three orders (intro-

duced, as he says, only when it was found necessary) to the institution of the apostles, “Et ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas sumtas de Veteri Testamento, quod Aaron, et filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi episcopi, et presbyteri, et diaconi vindicent in Ecclesia.” Hieron. Evangel. tom. iv. pt. 2. 803.]

before that, by the working of the devil, parts were taken in religion, and some said, I hold of Paul, some, I hold of Apollo, and some others, I hold of Peter, the churches were governed by the common council of the priests.” ➡

† Clemens, epist. 2. de Con. dist. 3. *Tribus gradibus* *mentis divinorum secretorum, id est, presbytero, diacono, et ministro*: “The mysteries of the holy secrecies be committed unto three orders: that is, unto the priests, unto the deacons, and unto the ministers:” and yet deacons and ministers, as touching the name, are all one.

Dionysii. Eccles. Hierar. cap. 5. [p. 190.]

Dionysius likewise hath three orders, but not the same: for he reckoneth bishops, priests, and deacons. And whereas M. Harding maketh his account of four of the less or inferior orders, meaning thereby *ostiaris*, *lectores*, *exorcistas*, *acolythos*: “the doorkeepers, the readers, the conjurers, and the waiters or followers⁵⁰:” his own Ignatius addeth thereto three other orders: *cantores*, *laboratores*, *confitentes*: “the chanters or singers, the labourers, and the confessors.” Clemens addeth thereto *catechistas*, “the informers or teachers” of them that were entering into the faith. A little vain book, bearing the name of St. Hierom, *De septem Ordinibus Ecclesiæ*, addeth yet another order, and calleth them *fossarios*, that is, “the sextines,” or overseers of the graves. And lest you should think he reckoneth this order as amongst other necessary offices to serve the people, and not as any part of the clergy, his words be these: *Primus in clericis fossariorum ordo est: qui in similitudinem Tobiae sancti sepelire mortuos admonent*: “The first order of the clergy is the order of the sextines: which, as holy Toby was wont to do, call upon the people for the burial of the dead.”

Ignatius ad Antiochen. [Russel ii. 250.]
ψάλτας, κοπιῶντας, ἐξορκίστας, ὁμολογητάς.

† Clemens, epist. 1. [Mansi i. 95.]

† Hieronym. de 7. Ordinibus Eccles. [v. 100.]

Isidor. Ety-molog. lib. 7. cap. 12.

Likewise to the three greater orders Isidorus addeth another distinct and several order of bishops⁵¹: unto whom agreeth Guilielmus Altisiodorensis⁵², and Gottofredus Picta-

⁵⁰ [Dionys. Pseudo—Areop. *ιεράρχης, ιερέϊς, λειτουργοί.*]

⁵¹ [“Ordo episcoporum quadripartitus est; in patriarchis, archiepiscopis, metropolitanis,

“atque episcopis.” Isidor. Ety-mol.]

⁵² [These names are not alluded to by Scotus in 4. Sent. Div. 24. qu. 1. to which the reference is given.]

viensis, as appeareth by Johannes Scotus. Again of the other inferior orders, St. Hierom leaveth out the “conjurers” and “waiters:” St. Ambrose leaveth out the “waiters” and “doorkeepers:” the canons of the apostles leave out “conjurers,” “waiters,” and “doorkeepers,” all three together.

Scotus in 4. sen. divis. 24. quest. 1.

† Ambros. in Epist. ad Ephes. cap. 4. [ii. app. 241.]

In this so great dissension and darkness, what way will M. Harding take to follow? By Anacletus there be two orders: by Clemens and St. Hierom, three: by Hierom counterfeit, seven: by others eight, by others nine, by others ten.

All this notwithstanding, he telleth us, our part had been to have shewed that there be just seven orders in the church, three great and four less, without doubt or question.

Here, gentle reader, it had been M. Harding’s part to have shewed us the reasons and grounds of this divinity: these they be, as they are alleged by the best of that side: Christ saith: “I am the door: *ergo*, there must be in the church an order of doorkeepers.” Christ saith: “I am the light of the world.” Hereupon have they founded the order of *acoluthes*, to carry tapers. And so for the rest. Thus much may serve for a taste.

Petr. Lombard. sen. lib. 4. dist. 24. [cap. 2.]

Now let us consider what these orders have to do, and with how holy and weighty offices they stand charged in the church of God. First, Clemens (of whose authority M. Harding maketh no small account, for he calleth him the apostles’ fellow) writeth thus: *Unus hypodiaconus det aquam manibus sacerdotum.... Duo diaconi ex utraque parte altaris teneant flabellum confectum ex tenuibus membranis, vel ex pavonum pennis, ... quibus leviter abigant prætervolantes bestiolas, ne in pocula incidant*: “Let one of the subdeacons give water to the priest’s hands: let two deacons stand at the two ends of the altar, either of them with a fan made of fine parchment, or of peacocks’ tails, therewith softly to chase away the flies, that they fall not into the communion cups.” The offices of other inferior orders be these, as they be noted by one of M. Harding’s own side: *Ad minores ordines hæc spectant: portare cereos et*

† Clem. Constit. Apost. lib. 8. cap. 15. [leg. capp. 11. & 12. Mansi i. 551.]

Aureum Speculum Papæ,
[in Append.
ad fascicul.
rer. expet. et
fug. ed. 1690,
p. 65.]

urceolum, et canes expellere de ecclesia: "To the less orders these things belong: to carry tapers, and holy water stocks, and to drive dogs out of the church." These, I trow, be the mystical holy orders, whereof M. Harding saith: "Our part had been to have made some long discourse:" being himself ashamed, as it may appear by his silence, either to name them in particular, or to open the secrets of their offices.

Howbeit, indeed, good Christian reader, sundry of these offices in the primitive church were appointed to very good and sober purposes. The "doorkeeper's" office was then to keep out excommunicate persons, that they should not press in among the faithful. The "psalmist's" or "singer's" office was to sing the psalms, thereby to move the people's hearts to devotion. The "exorcist's" office was, by a special gift of God, serving only for that time, to call forth foul spirits out of the bodies of them that were possessed. The "reader's" office was, openly, and plainly, and distinctly to pronounce the scriptures unto the people: and to this use the bishop delivered unto him a book with this charge: *Accipe, et esto relator verbi Dei*: "Take thou this book, and be thou a pronouncer of the word of God." And therefore Isidorus saith: *Tanta, et tam clara erit ejus vox, ut quamvis longe positorum aures adimpleat*: "The reader's voice must be so loud, and so clear, that it may be able to fill the ears of them that stand far off." The *acoluthes* or "waiter's" office was to attend upon the bishop, as a witness of his conversation.

Dist. 23. Lect.

Dist. 21.
Cleros.

To such good uses these offices then served in the church of God. But now there is nothing left, saving the bare name only, without any manner use or office. For neither doth the *ostiarius* keep out the excommunicates, nor doth the *acoluthus* wait upon the bishop, nor doth the *exorcist* cast forth devils, nor doth the "psalmist" sing psalms, nor doth the "reader" openly pronounce the scriptures, (I might yet step a little farther, to open the whole beauty of the clergy of Rome,) nor doth the deacon make provision for the poor, nor doth the bishop preach the word of God.

This had been our part to have opened at large: and for leaving of the same, we were worthy by M. Harding's judgment to be reprov'd.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 3. Divis. 2.*

Yet notwithstanding, we say that there neither is nor can be any one man which may have the whole superiority in this universal state: for that Christ is ever present to assist his church, and needeth not any man to supply his room, as his only heir to all his substance: and that there can be no one mortal creature which is able to comprehend, or conceive in his mind, the universal church, that is to wit, all the parts of the world, much less able rightly and duly to put them in order, and to govern them.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

M. Harding's answer hereto is long and tedious. The substance thereof in short is this: where we say, No one mortal man is able to wield the burden of the whole church of God, M. Harding answereth: "Where any thing is indeed, there, whether it may be or no, to discuss it is needless. Therefore whether any one man can be superior and chief over the whole church, we leave to speak: that so it is, thus we prove: Every parish hath his several vicar or parson: and every diocess his own bishop: *ergo*, what reason is it there be not one chief governor of the whole Christian people?

"When questions be moved in matters of faith, through diversities of judgments the church should be divided, unless by authority of one it were kept in unity.

"They that say otherwise, take from Christ the glory of his providence, and the praise of his great love towards his church?

"The peace of the church is more conveniently procured by one, than by many.

"It is most meet that the church militant, touching government, resemble the church triumphant. But in the triumphant church one is governor over the whole, that is God. Therefore in the church militant, order requireth that one bear rule over all: according to that the holy captain Joshua seemeth to speak:

'The children of Judah and the children of Israel shall assemble together, and they shall make to themselves one head.' Thereof our Lord saith in St. John: 'There shall be one fold, and one shepherd.'

A great oversight: for these be the words, not of the captain Joshua, but of the prophet Hosea.

[Vol. iv. p. 17.]

Joshua i.

John x. 16.

“Indeed Christ is head of his body. Yet need it is, forasmuch as Christ now dwelleth not with us in visible presence, his church have one man to do his stead of outward ruling in earth. And therefore he said unto Peter : ‘Feed my flock :’ ‘Confirm thy brethren.’

“Thus we see these defenders’ negative doctrine, That no one man may have the superiority over the whole state of the church, disproved as utterly false.

“To their second reason we grant, Christ needed not any man to supply his room, that should succeed in his whole substance. Neither is man of capacity of such succession : “neither hath there any such fond saying been uttered by the divines.

“But because Christ saw the knot of unity should be most surely kept knit by government of one, he ^bcommitted the regiment of the whole church unto one : whose visible ministry he might use instead of himself.

“To the third we say, that man is not only able to comprehend in his mind and conceive the universal church, but also to put it in order, and to govern it so far as is expedient.

“Last of all, whosoever will not be fed nor ruled by his own shepherd, and breaketh out of this one fold, he is not of the flock of Christ, but of the herd of Antichrist.”

Here, gentle reader, M. Harding hath brought thee, not the authority of any one catholic doctor or learned father, but only a few cold reasons of his own, with certain scriptures unadvisedly alleged, and violently forced from their meaning, as shall soon appear.

1 His first reason concludeth very weakly : every parish is governed by one vicar or parson : and every diocess is governed by one several bishop : *ergo*, there is one universal governor over the whole church of Christ. Here is neither order in reason, nor sequel in nature. Therefore if any man would deny the argument, M. Harding were never able to make it good. He might as well and in as good order reason thus : Every kingdom or commonweal hath one prince or magistrate to rule over it : *ergo*, there must be one universal prince to rule over the whole world. Or thus, Every flock of sheep hath one several shepherd to oversee them : *ergo*, all the flocks through the world ought to be overseen by one general shepherd. Otherwise M. Harding imagineth this foul absurdity must needs follow, that the part is better governed than the whole.

Addition. ☞ Here M. Harding answereth thus : “*I Addition.* see no absurdity in this conclusion. And perhaps, when

a Untruth.
For Panormi-
tane saith :
*Papa potest
quasi omnia
facere quæ
potest Deus.*
[tom. i. fol.
123. col. 4.]

b Untruth.

the matter is well weighed, it may seem, the world was never in better state than when it was governed by one good emperor." *The answer.* O, M. Harding, why should you so vainly avouch untruth? what one emperor had ever the regiment of all the world? where stood his palace? what was his name? why tell you such tales of those things that never were, and you certainly know they never were?

Indeed the emperors of Rome, after the time of Augustus Cæsar, had a great part of the world under their hands. But the whole world, you know, they never had: no, neither the half deal, nor the third, nor the fourth part of the world. Yet having only that they had, they grew so tyrannical and so intolerable over their subjects, and so licentious and monstrous in their lives, that, unless it be only among the popes, it is not possible to find so many the like examples of horror in any state or kingdom of the world. From the death of Augustus Cæsar unto Theodosius, within the space of less than four hundred years, more than forty emperors were slain with violence, one of them seeking traitorous means to murder another. When the prince's estate was so uncertain and miserable, what may we think was then the misery of the people? Yet, saith M. Harding, the world was never in better state. ➡

The other three reasons, touching the providence of God, the debating of questions in faith, and conserving of peace and unity in the church, are answered already in my former reply to M. Harding. Indeed, I remember, to avouch all that M. Harding hath here said, one sometimes well inclined to that side said thus: *Non videretur Dominus discretus fuisse (ut cum reverentia ejus loquar) nisi unicum post se talem vicarium reliquisset, qui hæc omnia posset*: "Christ our Lord should not have seemed to have dealt discreetly (to speak it with reverence) unless he had left one such vicar behind him, that might have done all these things."

I grant, dissension and quarrels be the sooner ended when all things be put over to one man: so that the same one man may live for ever, and still continue in one mind, and never alter. But oftentimes one pope is found con-

2, 3, 4.
In the fourth
Article,
and in the
eighteenth
and nine-
teenth Di-
visions.
[Supra, vol.
ii. 204.]
De Majori.
et Obedien.
unam Sanct.
In Glossa.

trary to another : and sometimes one pope hath been found contrary to himself. Pope Sabinianus would have burnt all pope Gregory's books. And, as it is said before, pope Romanus utterly abolished all the acts of his predecessor pope Stephen. The same pope Stephen unburied his predecessor pope Formosus, and defaced and mangled his naked carcass, and utterly condemned all that had been done by him before. And Platina giveth this general judgment of them : *Nihil aliud isti pontificuli cogitabant, quam ut nomen et dignitatem majorum suorum extinguerent* : "These little petite popes had none other care in the world, but how to deface the name and estimation of other popes that had been before them⁵³." And thus, that one pope liketh, another misliketh : that one alloweth, another condemneth. And yet, by M. Harding's judgment, we have none other rule to stay by in doubtful cases, but only the will and pleasure of the pope.

Platina in Sabiniano.

Sabellicus Enneade 9. lib. 1.

Platina in Stephano sexto.

Platina in Romano 1.

M. Harding, P. 139 b.

Platina in Stephano 6.

Stephanum tanta rable desævisse.

Palmerius, [ad A. D. 899.]

Dilanians.

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding findeth great fault, for *Addition.* that I say, pope Stephen defaced and mangled Formosus his predecessor's naked carcass. "The story," saith he, "maketh no mention of any such mangling." For proof whereof he allegeth Sabellicus. *The answer.* For trial hereof I report me to Platina. His words be these : *Hinc odium ortum est*, &c. : "Hereof grew that hatred that caused pope Stephanus to practise such cruelty upon the dead body of pope Formosus, for that in his lifetime he had hindered him from the obtaining of the popedom. Martinus saith that pope Stephanus was so wood⁵⁴, and so raged against Formosus, that he haled his dead carcass out of the grave, and caused it to be laid before himself and others in the council, and chopt off the two forefingers of his right hand, and threw them out into the stream."

Matthæus Palmerius Florentinus recordeth the same by these words : *Stephanus Formosi corpus pontificalibus insignibus exuit : deinde illud dilanians, omnique afficiens dedecore, manus ejus projecit in Tiberim* : "Pope Stephanus spoiled and stript Formosus his predecessor's body out

⁵³ [The substance of Platina's observation is given here, not the exact words.] ⁵⁴ [Wood — wode — wud = mad.]

of his pontifical robes : and after he had torn and rent the same body, and abused it with all kind of villainy, he chopt off both his hands, and threw them forth into Tiber."

Abbas Urspergensis saith further, pope Stephanus⁵⁵ Abbas Ursperg. [In A.D. 897.] Decollari præcepit. [leg. Sergius] commanded the carcass of pope Formosus to be beheaded : and the same body stript out of his holy robes, and spoiled of three fingers, to be thrown forth into the stream. The same story touching the drowning of the carcass is recorded also by Luitprandus Ticinensis⁵⁶. In an Luitprandus [de vit. Rom. Pontif. p. 118.] Memoriale Historiarum. old chronicle written in parchment, entituled *Memorale Historiarum*, which I have to shew, there is added further : *Quædam dictu horribilia in illum fecit* : "Pope Stephanus practised certain things upon pope Formosus, that are horrible to be spoken."

But perhaps M. Harding will refuse the authority of these writers, and of all others whatsoever, and will rather give credit to Sabellicus, whom also he hath noted in his margin. Let us therefore see the report of Sabellicus. Thus he saith : *Stephanus* [leg. *Sergius*] *Formosi cadaver iterum refossum, tanquam sic quoque pati aliquid atrocius posset, securi subjecit, corpus in Tiberim projici jussit, ut sepultura, et omni humano honore careret* : "Pope Stephanus digged up pope Formosus his predecessor's body, and beheaded it, as minding to make it to feel more villainy, and threw out his carcass into the Tiber, that he might bereave him of his grave, and of all other honour due to a man⁵⁷."

All this notwithstanding, M. Harding can devise how to cut off the pope's head, how to chop off his hands and fingers, how to hale out his naked carcass from the grave, how to spoil it, and tear it, and to abuse it with such villainy as may not be spoken, and how to throw the same

⁵⁵ [Abb. Ursperg. In the copy consulted by the Editor *Sergius* is named instead of Stephanus.]

⁵⁶ [Luitprandus reports this of Sergius, not of Stephanus.]

⁵⁷ [Jewel has transferred to Stephanus, who first disinterred and mangled the body of Formosus, the passage which Sabellicus wrote concerning Sergius who disinterred the same body '*iterum*.' Jewel

however is in great measure borne out by Sabellicus in respect to Stephanus, who cut off the three fingers, though, according to that author, he did not throw the body into the Tiber. It is strange however, that Jewel should have made the same mistake as to this name, in reporting Urspergensis, Luitprandus, and Sabellicus.]

out into a running stream to be devoured and swallowed of the fishes, and all this to do gently and in good order, without any manner defacing or mangling of his body. And therefore he concludeth, as his manner is, in this friendly sort: "Leave, leave that ill property for shame, M. Jewel: add not, diminish not," &c. ➤

Howbeit, this, I trow, is not the readiest way to procure peace, and to maintain unity in the church. And therefore Gregory saith of John the bishop of Constantinople, that claimed to himself this universal power, *Si hanc causam æquanimiter portamus, totius ecclesiæ fidem corrumpimus:.....corruiit universa ecclesia a statu suo, si is qui universalis dicitur cadit*: "If we quietly suffer this matter thus to proceed," (that one man shall be called the universal bishop, we seek not ways to maintain unity, but) "we overthrow the faith of the whole church: if he that is called the universal bishop happen to fall, the whole church falleth from her state⁵⁷." Thus therefore to allow any one man universal authority over the whole church, is a matter not behoveful and profitable, as M. Harding fancieth, but, as Gregory saith, doubtful, and dangerous to the church⁵⁸. For although all the world either would or could give ear and credit to one man, yet were not that therefore always Christian unity. St. Augustine saith: *Habet et superbia appetitum quendam unitatis et omnipotentia*: "Pride itself hath a certain desire of unity, and of universal power."

Addition. ➤ But M. Harding saith: "John the bishop of Constantinople by this title 'universal bishop,' meant to make himself the only bishop of all the whole world, that there should be no bishop but himself alone." *The answer.* This answer were somewhat, if any old writer might be found to say the same. But your bare phantasy, M. Hard-

⁵⁷ [The two first marginal references to Gregory were printed in the original edition, and relate to the subject of John of Constantinople: but the passage quoted will be found in lib. 6. ep. 24. The last sentence however is some-

what altered; "... si unus episcopus vocatur universalis, universa ecclesia corruiit: si unus universus cadit."]

⁵⁸ [Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 76. This is probably a false print for epist. 36.]

Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 34. [ii. 881.] 38. [ii. 742.] [lib. 6. ep. 24. ib. ii. 873.]

Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 76.

Augustin. de vera Reli. cap. 45. [i. 778.]

M. Harding, p. 141 a.

Addition.

ing, as it may appear, oftentimes wanteth weight. And how can you think it likely, that the bishop of Constantinople, were he never so proud a man, would suffer no man to be a bishop, that is to say, neither to ordain priests, nor to excommunicate, nor to absolve, nor to sit in council, but himself alone? by what evidence, by what record, by what practice of his part can you prove it? O what pretty tales ye would tell us if we would hear you!

Indeed the bishop of Constantinople, although he were ambitious above measure, yet he never, neither usurped, nor claimed any other authority in the church than that sithence hath been usurped and claimed by the pope. For thus it is written well near by all that have recorded the story of pope Boniface III.: *Institutum fuit, ut ecclesia Romana esset caput omnium ecclesiarum, cum prius Constantinopolitana ecclesia id usurpare tentasset*: “It was then ordained, that the church of Rome should be the head of all churches, whereas before the church of Constantinople had claimed that title unto herself⁵⁹.” So saith Sabellicus: *Græci illud decus ad se trahebant*: “The Greeks claimed the same dignity to themselves.” The same dignity, he saith, that now is claimed by the pope, and none other.

Palmerine
[in A. D. 607.]
Ursper-
gensis. [In
A. D. 607.]

Sabellicus
Enneade 8,
lib. 6.

Therefore, M. Harding, all that you tell us of one only bishop throughout the whole world, excluding all other bishops, saving himself alone, is but a fable without face or likelihood of any truth. ➡

Another of M. Harding's reasons is this: The church labouring here in earth must resemble the church of the saints triumphing in heaven. But in heaven God only is the governor over the whole: therefore in the church beneath, the pope likewise must needs be governor over the whole. Thus God must be rated to govern above, and the pope beneath: and so, as one sometime said: *Divisum imperium cum Jove Cæsar habet*.

This is a valiant kind of argument. It holdeth from

⁵⁹ [The words in the text are from the continuation of Eusebii Chronicon by Matthæus Palmerius Florentinus “Consentiente “Phoca institutum,” &c. The

words of Urspergensis are, “. . . . “nam antea Constantinopolitana “ecclesia se scribebat primam “omnium.”]

heaven to earth, from angels to men, from God to the pope.

But how knoweth M. Harding, what orders of angels and archangels there be in heaven: what they do: how they deal: who ruleth: who are ruled: what laws and policies they have amongst them? They say they would frame their church according to the sampler: and yet, good men, they never knew nor saw the sampler. But only of themselves they imagine commonweals and orders in heaven: and according to the same they would shape and fashion their own church in earth.

M. Harding,
fol. 142.

Addition. ☞ “Forsooth,” saith M. Harding, “I may *Addition.*

easily know that which is evident. For in the fourth of Matthew angels wait on Christ: and in the twelfth to the Hebrews there is mention made of thousands of angels.” *The answer.* All this, M. Harding, we grant.

Dan. vii. 10.

And Daniel saith further: “Thousand thousands of angels ministered unto God, and ten thousand thousands stood before him.” But what is all this to prove your

Coloss. i. 16.

orders? You say, St. Paul nameth “thrones,” “dominions,” “principates,” and “powers.” You might have added “archangels,” “cherubins,” and “seraphins.” But how know you hereby which angel is highest in order, and hath authority and government over all the rest, that you may apply this heavenly pattern unto the pope? Unless you shew us this, you shew us nothing, and cast fair colours without a ground. St. Augustine in this case

Augustin. in
Enchirid.
cap. 58. [v.
218.]

speaketh modestly of himself: *Quid inter se distent quatuor illa vocabula, throni, dominationes, principatus, potestates, dicant qui possunt, si tamen possunt probare quod dicunt. Ego me ista ignorare confiteor*: “What difference there is between these four words, ‘thrones,’ ‘dominions,’ ‘principates’ and ‘powers,’ let them tell us that be able, so that they can prove that they tell us. For my part, I confess I know it not.” If St. Augustine confess he knoweth it not, may we safely learn it of M. Harding?

Howbeit, as little as we know, or can know in these cases, yet hereof must we be taught to learn our obedience and subjection to the pope: that, as God alone ruleth over,

and over all the heavens, so ought the pope alone to rule over, and over the whole earth : and that, as all the powers of heaven cast off their crowns, and cry, Holy, holy, holy, unto God, so ought the powers and states of the earth likewise to fall down and submit themselves, and to yield all honour unto the pope. If this be not your meaning, M. Harding, then tell your tale plainly, that we may know it. ¶

The better way, M. Harding, had been, seeing the whole matter hangeth only upon your phantasies, to say, that God hath appointed one principal archangel to be pope in heaven, and all other powers, angels, and dominions to be subjects. Thus might you easily have made your frame to agree with your pattern, and the one of your fancies to answer the other.

For to say, as you say, God ruleth all in heaven above, therefore the pope must rule all in the world beneath, it is but a slender kind of reasoning. St. Augustine saith, *Quid aliud in pompa hujus mundi homo appetit, nisi solus esse, si fieri possit, cui multa subjecta sint : perversa scilicet imitatione omnipotentis Dei ?* “In the vain pomp of this world what thing else is it, that a man doth desire, but, if it were possible, to make himself alone such a one, unto whom many things may be obedient : and that by a peevish counterfeiting of God omnipotent ?”

Augustin. de
vera Relig.
cap. 45. [i.
778.]

And this is it, that Gregory saith of John the bishop of Constantinople : *Illum, videlicet, imitatur, qui, spreta angelorum societate, ascendere conatus est ad culmen singularitatis* : “He followeth Lucifer, who, despising the fellowship of the angels, laboured to get up to the top of singularity, and said, I will mount up above the north, and will be like unto the highest.”

Gregor. lib.
4. epist. 78.
[leg. 38. ii.
742.]
[Epist. 34.
ii. 751.]

Verily Dionysius writing purposely of the policy and government of the church, and comparing the same with the glorious government of the angels and powers in heaven, yet never uttered one word of the universal government of the pope. Nay rather in a little treaty joined to the council of Lateran, out of this very place is formed an argument to the contrary : *In cœlesti hierarchia tota congregatio angelorum non habet caput unum, præter solum*

In Opere
[Opusculo]
tripart. lib. 2.
cap. 5.
[Cæst. Con-
cil. tom. ii.
p. 989.]

Deum : ergo, a simili, in ecclesiastica hierarchia hominum non debet esse unum caput, præter solum Deum : “In the heavenly government the whole company of the angels hath none other one head, but only God : therefore of the like, in the ecclesiastical government amongst men, there ought not to be any one head, but only God.”

M. Harding,
fol. 144 a.

Addition. ¶ Here saith M. Harding, “I marvel, ye Addition. had the face to bring this forth. You shew yourself to be shameless.” *The answer.* And why so impatiently, M. Harding? “Marry,” say you, “is it not there set forth for an objection against the truth?” Neither do I say so : nor do I use it, as an argument taken against the truth. It is laid forth only, as an objection against the pope⁶⁰. Between the pope and truth there may be a difference, as you know, and as it is evident unto the world. But you say : “It is answered in the next chapter.” I grant you, it is answered indeed, but God wot, full slenderly, as the rest. Yet nevertheless my saying is true. For thus I say, Out of this place is formed an argument to the contrary, that is, against the supremacy of the pope. Behold my words better, M. Harding. This only I say. I say no more. And that I say, you know, is true. Ye were to blame therefore, thus without cause and out of season to waste your choler. ¶

Nevertheless M. Harding is well able to fortify all these things by the authority of the scriptures. And here instead of the first chapter of the prophet Osee, he allegeth the first chapter of the book of Joshua. And lest thou shouldst think it were only a marginal error, brought in by some oversight of the printer, as he useth sometimes to excuse and to shift the matter, he hath thus laid it wide open in his own text : “Hereof the holy captain Joshua seemeth to speak.” Howbeit, one error may the better be dissembled amongst so many. Neither would I have noted this oversight, were not M. Harding so immoderate in blaming others.

Indeed the prophet Osee, and not the holy captain Joshua, speaketh these words : but not, as M. Harding

⁶⁰ [The words are, “contra hoc :” “debet dici caput ecclesiæ totius that is, against the conclusion in “Christianorum, sed aliquis homo ch. 4. “Quod non solum Christus “minister et vicarius ejus.”]

imagineth, of the state of all Christendom under one pope, but of that unity and consent, that all the faithful of the world, as well Jews as Gentiles, should have under one Christ: as it is most evident by the whole discourse of the text.

Thus lie the words: "The number of the children of Hosea i. 10. Israel shall be as the sand of the sea shore, that cannot be numbered. And it shall come to pass in the place where it was said unto them, 'Ye are no people of mine,' there shall it be said unto them, 'Ye are the children of the living God.' And the children of Judah, and the children of Israel shall assemble together, and shall appoint unto themselves one head." Upon which words St. Hierom writeth thus: *Hæc omnia fient, quia magnus est dies seminis Dei, qui interpretatur Christus*: "All these things shall come to pass, because it is the great day of the seed of God, which seed is expounded" (not the pope, but) "Christ." Likewise Nicolaus Lyra: *Congregabuntur filii Juda, id est, apostoli: et filii Israel, id est, Gentiles conversi: pariter, id est, in una ecclesia: et ponent sibi caput unum, id est, Christum*: "There shall assemble together the children of Juda, that is to say, the apostles: and the children of Israel, that is to say, the heathens converted: 'together,' that is to say, in one church: and shall appoint unto themselves 'one head,' that is to say," (not one pope, as M. Harding would have it, but) "one Christ." St. Augustine expounding the same words saith thus: *Recolatur lapis ille angularis, et duo illi parietes, unus ex Judæis, et alter ex gentibus*: "Let us remember that corner stone" Augustin. de Civit. lib. 18. cap. 28. [viii. 509.] (that is, Christ, and not the pope) "and the two walls, the one of the Jews, the other of the heathens."

The other words, which M. Harding allegeth out of St. John, Christ himself expoundeth, not of the pope, but of himself: "I am the good Shepherd: I yield my life for John x. 11. 14. 16. my sheep: ...I know my sheep, and am known of them: ...I have other sheep, that be not of this flock: them I must bring, that they may hear my voice: and so shall there be one Shepherd and one flock." These words Chrysostom Ephes. ii. 15. expoundeth by the words of St. Paul: *Ut duos conderet in Chrysost. in Johan. hom. 59. [viii. 353.] semetipso in unum novum hominem*: "That he might work

two people into one new man" (not in the pope, but) "in himself."

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
47. [iii. pt. 2.
609.]

St. Augustine expounding the same, saith thus : *Duobus istis gregibus, tanquam duobus parietibus, Christus factus est lapis angularis* : "Unto these two flocks, as unto two walls," (not the pope, but) "Christ was made the corner stone."

Nicol. Lyra
in Johan. x.
[v. 1189.]

And what should I allege any other the old fathers ? Nicolaus Lyra, as simple an interpreter as he was, yet he likewise saith the same : *Fiet unus pastor, id est, Christus* : "There shall be one Shepherd, that is to say," (not the pope, but) "Christ." Neither is M. Harding able to shew us any learned allowed interpreter, old or new, that hath expounded this place otherwise.

All these things notwithstanding, as well these words of Christ, as also the other of the prophet Osee, M. Harding applieth only to the pope. "The pope must be the head : the pope must be the shepherd." Both Christ and Osee prophesied these things of the glory and kingdom of the pope. Judah and Israel shall choose Christ to be their head : all the faithful through the world are one flock, and Christ is the Shepherd : *ergo*, the pope is the general head of the universal church of God.

Sueton.
Tranquill. in
Caligula.
[cap. 22.]

Such logic M. Harding is able to teach us : and with such fear and reverence can he use God's holy word. And like as the emperor Caligula sometimes took off the head of his great god Jupiter, and set another head of his own : even so by these interpretations and glosses, M. Harding smiteth off Christ, the only head of the church, and setteth on the pope. For Johannes de Parisiis (out of whom, or some other the like, he hath borrowed this whole matter) nothing doubteth to tell us, that Christ is not, nor cannot be the head of this body, or the shepherd of this flock. And, lest M. Harding should charge me with untrue report, his words be these : *Congregabuntur filii Juda, et filii Israel, ut ponant sibi caput unum : et Johan. x. fiet unum ovile, et unus pastor. Quod quidem de Christo intelligi non potest : sed de alio aliquo ministro, qui præsit loco ejus* : "The children of Juda, and the children of Israel shall assemble together, to appoint unto themselves

Johan. de
Parisiiis, de
Potestate
Regia et Pa-
pali, cap. 3.
[111.]

one head. And in the tenth of John, 'There shall be made one fold, and one shepherd.' Which thing doubtless cannot be expounded of Christ: but must be taken of some other minister, that may rule in his stead."

Thus we are taught, that Christ is neither the head of his own body, the church, nor the shepherd of his own flock, but only the pope. For consider well these last words of Johanneſ de Parisiis, "Doubtless," saith he, "Christ cannot be this one shepherd. It must needs be some other minister" (that is, the pope) "that may rule instead of Christ." This one shepherd, saith he, cannot be Christ. Then must it only be the pope. And yet Chrysostom saith: *Qui non utitur sacra scriptura, sed ascendit aliunde, id est, non concessa via, hic non pastor est, sed fur*: Chrysost. in Johan. hom. 58. [viii. 346.]

"Whosoever useth not the holy scripture, but cometh in another way that is not lawful," (which is by false glosses and corruptions, so doth the bishop of Rome, and by such means hath won his universal authority, as it is easy to be proved,) "he is not the shepherd of the flock, he is the thief."

So saith St. Augustine: *Ipsum characterem multi et lupi, et lupis imprimunt*: "The note or mark of a bishop many give unto wolves, and be wolves themselves." Augustin. contra Donatist. lib. 6. [ix. 167.]

M. Harding saith further, Forasmuch as Christ is ascended into heaven, and is now no more conversant amongst us in visible form, as he was before, it behoved some one man to be put in commission for bearing the charge, and taking care of the whole church. Therefore he said unto Peter: "Feed my flock: confirm thy brethren." First, what ancient learned father ever thus scanned the words of the pope's commission? or why doth M. Harding avouch so great a matter of himself only, without farther authority? And if this so large commission be to feed, and to feed so many, why then doth the pope feed so little? or rather, why feedeth he nothing at all? or how can he claim by feeding, that never feedeth?

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding hath occasion of sundry answers. First, he saith: *Pascere* is not a word that signifieth "to feed" only, as you know, but also "to rule and

▲addition.

M. Harding, fol. 147 b.

1 Quæst. 3.
Vocantur
Canes.

govern." And therefore Homer calleth the king Agamemnon, ποιμένα λαῶν, that is to say, The ruler of the people."

The answer. Whether Christ by this word *pascere* meant "feeding" or "governing," it forceth not greatly. To quarrel for words, I have no skill. But why is Homer, the blind heathen poet, here alleged as an interpreter of Christ's meaning? or why is king Agamemnon's feeding or leading of his subjects brought in, to prove the feeding of the pope? Certainly Christ saith to Peter, and to other his

Matt. xx. 25. disciples: "Kings have power and government over their nations: but it shall not be so among you." The "feeding" that Christ meant stood not in sword or sceptre, but in word and doctrine. Therefore he said to his disciples:

Mark xvi. 15. "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every

1 Cor. iv. 1. creature." St. Paul saith: "Let a man so esteem us, as the servants of Christ, and the stewards of God's mysteries."

John x. 3. 4. And Christ himself saith: "My sheep hear my voice,

John viii. 47. and follow me." "He that is of God heareth the word of God." The manner of this feeding, St. Augustine ex-

Augustin. in presseth thus: *Non te pascere cogita, sed oves meas: sicut meas pasce, non sicut tuas: gloriam meam in illis quære, non tuam: dominium meum, non tuum: lucra mea, non tua*: "Think not to feed thyself, feed my sheep: feed them as my sheep, not as thine own: seek my honour in them, seek not thine: seek my ownership, and not thine: seek my gains, and not thine own." This is likely to be the feeding that Christ spake of.

M. Harding, fol. 147 b. Howbeit, as it may appear by M. Harding, the pope is not bound to this kind of feeding. It is sufficient for him to be as Agamemnon was, that is, a prince and a ruler of the people. God grant, the words of the prophet Ezekiel

Ezek. xxxiv. 2. be not found true in his feeding: "Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that feed themselves." The prophet Jere-

Jerem. xxii. 22. my saith: *Omnes pastores tuos pascet ventus*: "Wind and vanity shall feed all thy feeders." The apostle Judas

Jude ver. 12. saith: "They feed themselves, they are clouds without water."

M. Harding, fol. 147 b. But M. Harding hath here brought in Chrysostom, Ambrose, Arnobius, pope Leo, and pope Gregory, to prove

the authority of the pope. The place of Chrysostom is alleged and answered once before⁶¹. His words be these :

“ The charge to rule the whole church was given to Peter.” Chrysostom. in Matt. hom. 55. [viii. 548.]
 St. Ambrose saith : *Christus Petrum amoris sui velut vicarium relinquebat* : “ Christ left St. Peter as the vicar of his love.” Ambros. in Lucam, cap. 24. [i. 1542.]

To what purpose these latter words of St. Ambrose are alleged, I cannot tell. For it were hard for M. Harding to reason thus : Christ made Peter the vicar of his love ; *ergo*, the pope is lord and feeder of all the world. Undoubtedly St. Ambrose in that whole place hath not one word, neither of one general feeder, nor of Peter’s successor, nor of the pope : therefore M. Harding doth well thus to qualify the weakness of his evidence : for thus he saith : “ St. Ambrose saith in effect as much as I said.” M. Harding, fol. 148 a.

And what is that ? Verily, good reader, in effect it is as much as nothing. St. Paul saith of himself and others :

Legatione pro Christo fungimur : “ We are ambassadors or messengers for Christ,” that is to say, we are his vicars :

and Christ saith to his disciples all together : “ As my living Father sent me, even so do I send you,” that is to say, you are the vicars of my love. Shall we therefore hereof conclude, that Paul, and every of all the disciples, had universal power over the whole church of God ? O,

M. Harding, howsoever the pope feed the people, you should not feed us with such vanities. But Chrysostom, you say, saith thus : “ The charge to rule the whole church was given to Peter.” These words are pregnant, and prove the purpose. But as I have told you, Theodoretus hath written the like words of Chrysostom himself : *Chrysostomus doctor orbis terrarum* : “ Chrysostom the doctor or master of the world.” M. Harding, fol. 147 b.

Yet was not Chrysostom therefore, neither universal bishop, nor head of the church. [Supra, vol. ii. 300.]
Theodoret. lib. 5. cap. 32. [iii. p. 232.]

Now forasmuch as you have many times in one place alleged these selfsame words by Chrysostom spoken of Peter, as having some special affiance in the weight of them, may it please you therefore to consider, what words the same Chrysostom hath likewise uttered of St. Paul. M. Harding, p. 145 b. 147 b. 151 b. 152 a.

Thus therefore he saith : *Hoc docet nos Paulus magister* Chrysostom. in Genesin, hom. 7. [iv. 50.]

⁶¹ [See Replie, Art. iv. Div. 31. vol. ii. 295.]

orbis : "This thing doth Paul teach us being the master of the world⁶²." Again : *Paulo tribuitur cura omnium ecclesiarum : non unius, vel duarum, vel trium, sed omnium, quæ sunt in toto orbe* : "Unto Paul the charge of all churches is committed : not of one, or two, or three churches, but of all the churches that be in all the world⁶³."

Again : "Paul being a persecutor and a blasphemer, is made the preacher of all countries⁶⁴, and ruleth the church throughout all the world⁶⁵."

"Paul governeth and ruleth all the whole world⁶⁶ :"
"Paul was the apostle of the whole compass of the earth⁶⁷ :"
"all the world was committed to Paul :"
"Paul had the oversight :"
"Paul was the warden of all the world⁶⁸."

I pass over a great number of other like sentences of Chrysostom and others, whereof some part I have touched some other where. And what will you conclude hereof, M. Harding? that Paul was the head of the universal church? Doubtless these words, thus uttered of him, import no less. But what will you then do with St. Peter? for to set two heads upon one body, it were over much.

But to pass by, and to dissemble all that may be spoken of Paul and Peter, what if the pope himself give the same style and title unto sundry others inferior bishops? what if they be called the overseers of the whole universal church, and that even by the mouth of the pope himself? Mark therefore what pope Eleutherius writeth to the bishop of France : *Universalis vobis a Christo ecclesia com-*

In Gen. hom.
11. [iv. 90.]

In Johan.
hom. 11.
[viii. 69.]

In Act. hom.
53. [ix. 402.]

De Laudib.
Pauli hom. 2.
[il. 485.]

In 1 Cor.
hom. 21. [x.
181.]

In Serm. de
Eleemosyna.
[ed. Paris
1588. iv. 625.]
De Precat.
lib. 2. [ii.
787.]

Contra Ju-
dæos, orat. 5.
[ed. Paris.]

† Epist.
Eleut. ad
Episcop.
Gallie.
[Crabb. 1.
92.]

⁶² [Chrysost. in Genes. hom. 7. . . . ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος, ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος.]

⁶³ [Chrysost. in Genes. hom. 11. . . . ἡ μέριμνα, φασὶ, πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, οὐχὶ μιᾶς καὶ δύο καὶ τριῶν, ἀλλὰ πασῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅσην γὰρ ἥλιος διατρέχει γῆν, κ. τ. λ.]

⁶⁴ [Chrysost. in Johan. 11. . . . καὶ ὁ διώκτης, καὶ βλάσφημος, καὶ ὑβριστής, κήρυξ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπεδείκνυτο.]

⁶⁵ [Chrysost. in Act. 50. . . . ὁ ἐπιστῆμων κυβερνήτης τοῦ μὴ κυβερνήτου ἐχρηξε, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ ὄντος

κυβερνήτου· οὐ γὰρ τοιοῦτον ἐκ-
βέρνα σκάφος, ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης
τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.]

⁶⁶ [Chrysost. de Laudib. Pauli. . . . ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰς αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν ἀγγέλων) τὸ ἔθνος ὁ ἐνεπιστεύθη οὕτως ὠκονόμησεν ὡς Παῦλος τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν.]

⁶⁷ [Chrysost. in 1 Cor. hom. 21. . . . καὶ γὰρ τῆς οἰκουμένης Ἀπόστολος ἦν.]

⁶⁸ [Chrysost. de Prec. lib. 2. ἐκείνος τοίνυν ὁ φύλαξ τῆς οἰκουμένης. The genuineness of this work is doubtful.]

missa est: "The universal church is committed to you by Christ." Will you therefore tell us, M. Harding, that the bishops of France are the popes of Rome? or that they have universal power over all the world? Thus you see, how vainly ye busy yourself, withdrawing the good sayings and sentences of holy fathers from their meaning.

Further you say: "Christ left not only Peter to be the successor of his love for his own life only, but also Peter's successors for ever, that is to say, the popes: for other Peter's successors" (you say) "we know not." And are you well assured, M. Harding, that every pope is the successor and heir of Christ's love without exception? Would God they were. The world should have less cause to be offended. But Christ's love passeth not by inheritance, or succession of sees. Whosoever is ready to give himself for the flock of Christ, be he pope, or bishop, or inferior priest, he is the vicar of Christ's love. In the end hereof M. Harding of his modesty chargeth us with boasting challenges, and bold talks, and prating in pulpits. ➡

Again, where learned M. Harding to reason thus? Christ is ascended into heaven: *ergo*, the pope is head of the whole world: or thus, Christ said to Peter, Feed my flock: *ergo*, the pope hath universal power over the whole church of God: how can he make these arguments to hold, I will not say by divinity, but by any reasonable shift of logic?

But ye say, God speaketh not now unto us mouth to mouth: nor sendeth us down his angels from heaven: nor instructeth us now by visions, as he did others in the old times. What of that? will it therefore follow, that all the world must give ear to the pope? Nay, M. Harding, Chrysostom saith much better: 'Because God speaketh not now unto us in such familiar sort: *ergo*, *Suam erga homines amicitiam innovare volens, quasi longe absentibus literas mittit, conciliaturus sibi universam hominum naturam*:"

Chrysostom.
in Genesin,
hom. 2. [iv.
9.]

"Therefore God, minding to renew his favour towards man, sent (his holy scriptures, as it were) his letters, thereby to reconcile to himself all mankind." God speaketh not now unto us by his angels, but he hath already spoken unto us, as St. Paul saith, by the mouth and presence of

Heb. 1. 2.

Galat. i. 8. his only Son. And therefore he saith again : " If an angel from heaven would now preach unto us otherwise than we have received, we should hold him accursed."

But for the unity and quiet government of the church of God, St. Paul saith : " Christ ascending above all the heavens hath given" (not one universal pope to rule the whole, but) " some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, some doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ, that we may all come into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God." By these means God thought it sufficient to preserve his church in unity, and never made mention of one universal pope.

Cyprian. de Simplicit. Prælatorum. [p. 195.] Therefore St. Cyprian saith : *Unus est episcopatus, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur* : " There is but one bishoprick, part whereof of every several bishop is holden

Cyprian. lib. 3. epist. 13. [p. 116.] in whole." And again : *Ideo plures sunt in ecclesia sacerdotes, ut, uno hæresim faciente, cæteri subveniant* : " There-

Galat. ii. 11. into heresy, the rest may help⁶⁹." Thus, when Peter walked not uprightly to the gospel, Paul came with help and

Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 21. [ii. 292.] reproved him openly, even to his face : thus Irenæus reproved pope Victor : thus sundry godly fathers have

Augustin. epist. 28. [ii. 587.] reproved others. Therefore St. Augustine saith : *Deus docuit Petrum per posteriorem Paulum. A quocunque enim verum dicitur, illo donante, dicitur, qui est ipsa veritas* : " Thus God instructed Peter by Paul his puny, that was called after him. For by whomsoever the truth is spoken, it is spoken by his gift, that is, truth itself."

In Concil. Lateran. sub Julio. In Concil. Lateran. sub Leone : In oratione Stephani Patracensis. [Harduin. ix. 1789.] Ye say, the pope succeedeth not Christ in all his substance, that is to say, in all his power : neither hath there any such fond saying been uttered, say you, at any time by the divines. If this be true, wherefore then be these words written, and so well allowed of in the council of Lateran : *Tibi data est omnis potestas, in cælo, et in terra* : " Unto

⁶⁹ [Cyprian. lib. 3. epist. 13. "et gregem Christi lacerare et Idcirco . . . copiosum corpus est "vastare tentaverit, subveniant sacerdotum . . . ut, si quis ex "cæteri."]
"collegio nostro hæresim facere

your holiness all power is given, as well in heaven, as in earth?" Wherefore is Bernard so well allowed to force the same farther with these words: *Qui totum dedit, nihil excludit*: "He that hath given thee all hath excepted nothing?" wherefore is Panormitane allowed to say: *Papa potest omnia, quæ Deus ipse potest*: "The pope is able by his power to do whatsoever God himself can do?"

Panormitan.
de Elect.
cap. Licet.
[tom. i. fol.
123. col. 4. f.]

For the rest, M. Harding saith: One king is able to rule one kingdom: *ergo*, one pope is able to rule the whole church. This reason is very simple, and is answered before. Of the government of princes we have daily practice: but of popes, that ever exercised this universal dominion over the whole church of God, M. Harding is not able to shew us one. Or if he be able to lay forth one, let him shew him for his credit's sake. If there be not one such example to be found from the ascension of Christ unto this day, then, although the pope had it in claim by charter, yet hath he lost it by non-usure. Well were it with him, if he were but a member of Christ's body, and a sheep of his flock. St. Gregory said sometime to John the bishop of Constantinople, claiming unto himself the same title, and thinking himself able enough to rule the whole: *Quid tu Christo universalis ecclesiæ capiti in extremi judicii responsurus es* [leg. *es dicturus*] *examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibi met conaris universalis appellatione supponere?* "What answer wilt thou make in the trial of the last judgment, unto Christ the head of his universal church, that thus by the name of universal bishop seekest to bring under thee all the members of his body?"

Gregor. lib.
4. epist. [ii.
742.]

Last of all, M. Harding concludeth without premisses: whosoever will not be ruled by this shepherd the pope, is of the herd of Antichrist. So saith one of the pope's hired proctors: *Quicquid salvatur, est sub summo pontifice*: "Whatsoever soul is saved, it is under the pope." This one thing being granted, M. Harding's whole cause passeth clear.

De Majorit.
et Obedien.
Unam
sanct. in
Glossa.

But God be thanked, it appeareth already to all them that have eyes to see, that we have not departed from the servile obedience of that see, but upon just cause and good

advice : and in such sort the pope himself will not deny, but it is lawful for any church to dissent from the church of Rome. These be his words, which must be holden for a law : *Quicquid sine discretionē justitiæ contra Romanæ ecclesiæ disciplinam actum fuerit, ratum haberi nulla ratio permittit* : “ Whatsoever thing is done without discretion of justice, against the order of the church of Rome, it may not by any means be allowed.” By which words it appeareth, *ex contrario sensu*, “ by an argument of the contrary,” that, whatsoever is done by discretion of justice, notwithstanding it be against the order of the church of Rome, yet ought it to be well allowed.

Dist. 12.
Non decet.

M. Harding,
p. 155.

Addition. ¶ To this M. Harding answereth : If I had *Addition.* seen the folly hereof, I would never have printed it for very shame. For the Gloss there, which otherwheres he condemneth as pelting and beggarly, saith thus : Here the argument of the contrary sense is avoided and taketh no place. But indeed, as it may appear, this poor glosser himself was void of somewhat. For thus he concludeth, and that very well, to M. Harding’s liking : “ That without the authority of the church of Rome we may do nothing, be it never so just and true, and never so much done by discretion of justice.” Yet, good reader, truth is truth, and one for ever, whether the church of Rome will allow it or no.

St. Ambrose saith, as in the same place he is alleged :

Dist. 12. 111a. *Ego cum Romam venio, Sabbatum jejuno : cum Mediolani*
[Augustin. ad
Januarium, ad
lib. 1. tom.
ii. p. 124 F.] *sum non jejuno* : “ When I come to Rome, I fast on the Saturday : when I am at Milan, I fast not.” By these we see, that in the church of Milan the Saturday was not fasted. And yet did they well, and according to the discretion of justice, and yet contrary to the order of the church of Rome.

[Augustin. ad
Januarium,
lib. 1. tom.
ii. p. 124 D.]

St. Augustine likewise in the same place saith : “ Whatsoever things are not contrary, neither to the catholic faith, nor to good manners, they must be taken as things indifferent.” Thus the Gloss, that M. Harding so much commendeth, is quite contrary to the text. As for the order of the church of Rome, the holy catholic fathers sometimes, as it may appear, have little esteemed it.

St. Hierom thereof saith thus unto Evagrius : *Quid mihi proferens unius urbis consuetudinem ?* “What bringest thou me the custom of Rome, that is but one city?” As if he would say, Is that order sufficient to bind the whole church of Christ? “If ye reckon authorities, the world is greater than the city of Rome.” This had been proudly and disdainfully spoken, had the order of Rome been a sufficient direction for all the world. 

Hieronym.
ad Evagrium.
[iv. pt. 2.
p. 803.]

St. Augustine saith : *Ne catholicis quidem episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte falluntur, ut contra canonicas scripturas aliquid sentiant* : “We may not give our consent unto any bishops, be they never so catholic, if they happen to be deceived, and to determine contrary to the scriptures.”

Augustin. de
Unitate Ec-
cles. Catho-
licæ, cap. 10.
[ix. 355.]

And pope Pius the Second himself saith : *Resistendum est quibuscunque in faciem, sive Paulus, sive Petrus sit, qui ad veritatem non ambulat evangelii* : “We are bound to withstand any man to the face, be it Peter, be it Paul, if he walk not to the truth of the gospel.”

Abbas Ur-
sper. p. 443.

To conclude, where the wolf is broken in, it is best for the poor sheep to break out. That the wolf was broken in, beside the cruel spoil, and ravening of Christian blood, it is plain by the words of St. Bernard. For thus he speaketh thereof in open council, and in the presence of sundry bishops : *Non custodiunt gregem Domini, sed mactant, et devorant* : “They keep not the Lord’s flock, but they kill it, and devour it.” Again he saith : *Propterea relinquamus istos, quia non sunt pastores, sed traditores* : “Therefore let us leave them, for they are not pastors, but traitors.” And therefore God thus warneth us in the like case : *Exite de medio horum hominum, ne cum illis pereatis* : “Go forth from the middes of those men, lest ye perish altogether.”

Bernardus
in Concil.
Remen.
In eodem
Concilio.

Numb. xvi.
26.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 3.

For all the apostles, as Cyprian saith, were of like power among themselves, and the rest were the same that Peter was.

M. HARDING.

Peter's
power ordi-
nary.

The apostles'
power extra-
ordinary.

Peter is the
shepherd ;

The apostles
are the sheep.

Manifest
and mere un-
truths.

Power is double, the one ordinary, the other by privilege or extraordinary. Ordinary power is that which continueth in one and the same course for ever. According to which power Peter was head of the church, and his successors after him. Power by privilege, or extraordinary, is that which is given besides the common course by way of dispensation. As where the other apostles should have received ordinarily their power from Peter, as who had commission over all, both lambs and sheep, among whom the apostles had their place : Christ by special grace preventeth ordinary course, and maketh them for the time, and in their persons equal with Peter in the office of apostleship. Thus concerning ordinary power, Peter is head of the apostles, and by that reason they are subject unto him, as sheep unto their shepherd. But by privilege, true it is, as St. Cyprian saith, " They were of like power among themselves." ^aNow what odds there is betwixt an ordinary auctority of judging given to any officer, for himself and his successors in that office for ever, and a special commission for lifetime only : so much is betwixt Peter and the rest of the apostles.

a Peter hath
power to
him, and to
his heirs for
ever.

The apostles
have power
only for term
of life.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Cyprian. de
Simplicit.
Prælatorum.
[p. 195.]

St. Cyprian's words be plain : *Hoc erant utique et cæteri apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis. Sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia una monstretur* : " The rest of the apostles were the same that Peter was, all endued with one fellowship both of honour and of power. Yet the beginning is taken of one, to shew that the church is one." But all these words, be they never so plain, are soon shifted by a pretty distinction, such as neither St. Cyprian nor any other learned father or doctor ever knew.

We are taught here to understand that there are two powers : the one ordinary, the other extraordinary. By ordinary power, saith M. Harding, that is to say, by order and of common course, Peter appointed all the rest of the apostles, and gave them authority. And Christ also likewise gave them authority, but by extraordinary power, that is to say, besides order, and out of course. Or, to utter the matter in plainer wise, Peter gave power to the apostles by his usual authority, and by due form of law :

but Christ gave them power, as M. Harding saith, only for the time, and by way of dispensation, and besides the law. And thus Peter is the ordinary head of the apostles: Christ is their head too, howbeit not in like sort, but extraordinary. For, as touching order of government, Peter is the shepherd, and the apostles are the sheep. All other the apostles hold their power, as by copy, for term of life: Peter only holdeth the same in fee simple, to him and to his heirs for ever.

And, good Christian reader, lest thou shouldest think I have in scorn and wilfully wrested M. Harding's words, which otherwise might be uttered by him in some sober meaning: may it please thee by these few to consider what certain others of that side have uttered and published touching the same.

Petrus de Palude saith thus: *Dico, quod nullus apostolorum, præter Petrum, factus est a Christo episcopus*: “I say, that none of the apostles, saving only Peter, was made bishop by Christ.” And again: *Videretur, in Novo Testamento, quod alii apostoli a Christo nullam potestatem jurisdictionis receperunt: et per consequens relinquitur, quod omnis potestas jurisdictionis, quam habuerunt apostoli, specialiter post Christi ascensum, fuit collata eis a Petro*: “It would appear, that in the New Testament the rest of the apostles received no manner power of jurisdiction at Christ's hands: and so consequently it followeth, that all the power of jurisdiction that the apostles had, specially after Christ's ascension, was given unto them by Peter.” Again, he imagineth God the Father thus to say unto Christ: *Constitues eos principes, non per te, sed per tuum vicarium*: “Thou shalt make the apostles governors over all the earth, not by thyself, but by Peter thy vicar.” And again: *Paulus et alii apostoli a Petro [leg. a Christo], non debuerunt prædicare in ecclesia specialiter Petro commissa, nisi de ejus licentia. Unde a Christo habuerunt idoneitatem: a Petro autem auctoritatem*: “Paul and the other apostles might not preach in the church committed unto Peter, but with Peter's license. For of Christ they had only ability: but of Peter they received authority.” In

Petr. de
Palude de Po-
test. Aposto-
lor. art. 2.

Petr. de
Palude in
eodem art.

Petr. de
Palude in
eodem cap.

Petr. de
Palude de
Potesta. Cu-
rator. art. 6.

In 60. de
Elect. et E-
lecti potest.
Fundamenta.

like manner writeth pope Nicolas: *Petrum in consortium individuae unitatis*⁷⁰ [ed. 1570 *Trinitatis*] *assumptum, id, quod ipse erat, Dominus voluit nominari*: "Our Lord took Peter into the fellowship of the holy unity [ed. 1570 *Trinity*], and would have him called the same that he was himself."

By such amplifications and outrage in speech, it would appear Christ were Peter's vicar: and not Peter vicar unto Christ. In this sense and meaning M. Harding seemeth to say, that by ordinary and common course of law, the apostles had all their power, not from Christ, but only from Peter.

But here M. Harding unwares falleth into a marvellous inconvenience. For these things thus granted, it must needs follow, that during the time of Christ's abode in earth the apostles had no manner ordinary power at all: neither to preach, nor to baptize, nor to bind, nor to loose. For Hervæus, a doctor of M. Harding's side, saith thus: *Sciendum, quod cum Christus conversabatur cum hominibus, non fuit alius papa præter ipsum, nec Petrus tunc habuit potestatem papalem*: "We must understand, that while Christ was conversant amongst men in earth, there was none other pope but he alone: neither then had Peter the pope's authority."

Hervæus de
potestate
Papæ.
His suppo-
sitis.

So likewise saith Petrus de Palude: *Non decebat esse simul, nisi unum summum pontificem. Unde Christo ascensuro debuit Petrus fieri episcopus summus, et non antea*: "It was not meet there should be more than one highest bishop at one time. Therefore when Christ was ready to ascend into heaven, it was convenient to make Peter the highest bishop, and not before."

Petr. de
Palude de
Potesta. A-
postolorum.

For so long time Christ could not give his apostles any ordinary authority: for M. Harding telleth us, that his power herein was only extraordinary. Of the other side Peter could give them none: for as Hervæus and Paludensis say, Until Christ's ascension he was not pope.

⁷⁰ [The true reading, according to all the copies of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* consulted for the present edition, is "unitatis," and it is remarkable, that the Editor of

1609 and 1611 (being probably aware of this fact) substituted this reading for that of "*Trinitatis*," which is found in the ed. of 1570. See vol. ii. p. 310, note ¹³.]

But to leave these vain phantasies, not worth the hearing, St. Paul will soon remove all these doubts: thus he writeth of himself: "Paul the apostle, not of men, nor appointed by men, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father." And St. Chrysostom hereof writeth thus: *Paulus nihil opus habebat Petro, nec illius egebat voce: sed honore par erat illi.* Chrysost. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. i. [x. 677.] *Nihil enim hic dicam amplius:* "Paul had no manner of lack of Peter, nor stood in need of his voice or allowance: but in honour was his fellow. For I will here say no more." His meaning is, he was his better.

Howbeit, what need words? Set contention apart, the case is clear: for it was not Peter, that breathed over the apostles: it was not Peter, that said unto them, "Go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel:" "Receive the Holy Ghost:" "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel." Matt. x. 6. John xx. 22. Mark xvi. 15. All this power was given them by Christ alone, and not by Peter.

Now, whereas M. Harding teacheth us, that Peter was the shepherd, and the apostles the sheep, making them all as much inferior unto Peter, as the sheep is inferior unto the shepherd; St. Hierom saith, notwithstanding he grant, that of the twelve apostles one was chosen, that, a head being appointed, occasion of discord might be removed, yet he saith: *Super Petrum fundatur ecclesia: licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes apostolos fiat, et cuncti claves regni cælorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur:* Hieron. adv. Jovinian. lib. i. [iv. pt. 2. 168.] "Ye will say, the church is founded upon Peter: notwithstanding in another place the same thing is done upon all the apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the strength of the church is founded equally upon them all." Likewise the learned father Origen saith: *Quod si super unum illum Petrum tantum existimas ædificari totam ecclesiam, quid dicturus es de Johanne filio tonitruui, et apostolorum unoquoque?* Origen. in Matt. tract. i. [iii. 524.] "If thou think the whole church was builded only upon Peter, what wilt thou then say of John the son of the thunder, and of every of the apostles?"

Therefore St. Chrysostom of Peter saith thus: *Duplex crimen erat: tum quia repugnauit, tum quia cæteris seipsum præposuit:* Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 83. [vii. 785.] "Peter was in double fault: both for that he

withstood Christ, and also for that he set himself before the rest⁷¹.”

Addition. ☞ It may be said, These words are not specially spoken of the superiority of St. Peter. All this I grant: yet by the same words he is blamed for setting himself before the rest. But in the same homily Chrysostom calleth Peter *verticem apostolorum*, “the head of the apostles⁷²,” saith M. Harding. So doth the same Chrysostom call Elias *caput prophetarum*, “the head of the prophets.” Yet had not Elias therefore all other prophets in subjection. St. Gregory calleth Paul *caput nationum*, “the head of nations⁷³ :” and Chrysostom saith: “Paul was in a manner the common father of all the world⁷⁴.” Again he saith: *Nullus Paulum antecedit. De ea re nemo omnium dubitat*: “No man hath place before Paul. And thereof no man doubteth⁷⁵.” Yet was not Paul therefore the bishop of Rome. ☞

St. Augustine maketh Peter fellow and equal with the other apostles: *Inter se concorditer vixerunt Petrus, et discipuli ejus*: “Peter and his fellows lived agreeably together.” And again: *Christus.....sine personarum acceptione.....hoc dedit Paulo ut ministraret gentibus, quod etiam Petro dederat ut ministraret Judæis*: “Christ without any choice of persons gave the same (authority) to Paul to minister among the heathens, that he gave to Peter to minister among the Jews.” And the very ordinary Gloss giveth these words to St. Paul: *Non didici ab aliis tanquam a majoribus: sed contuli cum illis tanquam cum amicis et paribus*: “I learned not of (Peter and) others as of my betters: but I had conference with them as with my equals and friends.” Likewise Paul himself saith: *Jacobus, Petrus, Johannes, qui videbantur columnæ esse, dextras*

⁷¹ [Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 83. tom. vii. 785. Καὶ γὰρ δύο τὰ ἐγκλήματα ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἀντίπε, καὶ ὅτι τῶν ἄλλων ἐαυτὸν προὔθηκε.]

⁷² [Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 83. tom. vii. 784. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν κορυφαῖον ἀφήσιν ἀρνήσασθαι.]

⁷³ [Gregor. ad I Reg. “Sed qui talis exstitit Christum persequens, “ad Christum conversus, caput

“effectus est nationum.” The genuineness of this work is doubtful of.]

⁷⁴ [Chrysost. de laudib. Pauli. καὶ ὥσπερ κοινὸς πατὴρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὤν, κ. τ. λ.]

⁷⁵ [Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 66. ὅτι δὲ Παύλου οὐδεὶς πρῶτος στήσεται, παντὶ που δῆλον.]

M. Harding
fol. 157 b.

Chrysost.
ad Roman.
hom. 18.
fol. 300. [ix.
636.]

Gregor.
1. Reg. lib. 4.
cap. 4. [iii.
pt. 2. 250.]

Chrysost. de
Laudib.
Pauli, hom.
3. [ii. 490.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
66. [vii. 648.]

Augustin.
epist. 86.
[cap. 6. ii.
76.]

Augustin.
in Epist. ad
Galat. cap. 2.
[iii. pt. ii.
947.]

Gloss. Gal. ii.

Galat. ii. 9.

dederunt mihi et Barnabæ societatis : “ James, Peter, and John, that seemed to be the pillars, gave unto me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship.” Which the Gloss expoundeth thus : *Societatis, id est æqualitatis* : “ Of fellowship, that is to say, of equality.”

Therefore, notwithstanding M. Harding’s ordinary and extraordinary distinctions, St. Cyprian’s words are plain and true : “ The rest of the apostles were even the same” (in authority) “ that Peter was, all endued with one fellowship, both of honour and of power.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 4.

And that it was said indifferently to them all, “ Feed ye :” indifferently to them all, “ Go into the whole world :” indifferently to them all, “ Teach ye the gospel.”

M. HARDING.

We deny that it was said indifferently to them all, “ Feed ye.”

Yea, or that it was said at all, “ Feed ye.” ^aTo Peter, and none else, was it said, “ Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.” Which word of feeding so singularly spoken to Peter in the presence of the other apostles, proveth that it was not indifferently said to all, “ Feed ye.” That they were sent into the whole world, and that they were commanded to teach, and in that respect also to feed, we confess, under the distinction of ordinary and extraordinary power before mentioned.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It forceth not greatly what M. Harding deny or grant, having neither reason nor authority, but only his own. But if power were not given indifferently to all the apostles, tell us then, as touching feeding, wherein is the odds ? what had Peter more ? what had the others less ? or what old doctor or learned father ever saw this difference ?

Addition.  Here M. Harding only crieth out : “ Impu- dency and shame upon us :” and sheweth nothing. And no great marvel. For nothing was to be shewed. 

Christ said equally unto them all : “ Receive the Holy Ghost : Whose sins ye forgive, they are forgiven :” “ Go into the whole world : Preach the gospel to every

[Vol. iv. p. 17.]

John xxi. 15.

Mark xvi.

^a Untruth most vain and manifest.

^{M. Harding, p. 159.}

John xx. 22.

Mark xvi. 15.

creature.” These words pertain equally unto all. Peter had no more the Holy Ghost, no more power to forgive sins, no more commission to go into the whole world, no more authority to preach the gospel, than others had.

M. Harding saith: To the rest of the apostles it was not said at all, “Feed ye.” To Peter and to none else was it said: “Feed my lambs: feed my sheep.”

Addition. ¶ Yet the ancient learned father Origen, *Addition,* speaking namely of these words, “Upon this rock will I build my church,” and, “To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” saith thus: *Hæc velut ad Petrum dicta, sunt omnium communia*: “These words being spoken as unto Peter, are common to all the apostles.” These words, saith he, are not spoken directly, or only unto Peter, but as unto Peter. And the other apostles have the keys, and are the rock as well as Peter. If this be true, as it is, with what good countenance then can M. Harding so boldly tell us: “To Peter and none else was it said, ‘Feed my lambs, feed my sheep’⁷⁶?” ¶

And St. Hierom saith, as it is before alleged: “All the apostles received the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and the strength of the church was built equally upon them all.” St. Paul saith: “What is Apollo, what is Paul, but the ministers of Christ through whom ye have believed? Paul hath planted, Apollo hath watered. He that planteth is nothing, he that watereth is nothing.” Chrysostom saith: *Angeli, quamlibet magni, tamen servi sunt, ac ministri*: “The angels of God, be they never so great, yet are they but servants and ministers.” Therefore, to conclude, he saith: *Ne Paulo quidem obedire oportet, si*

⁷⁶ [It is, no doubt, true by analogy that the word “pascite” applies to all the apostles as well as to St. Peter; but Harding is surely right according to the letter in saying, “To Peter and none else was it said, ‘Feed my lambs, feed my sheep.’” But the very form of the sentence in the Apology laid its author open to Harding’s attack: “omnibus ex æquo dictum fuisse, Pascite; omnibus, ‘Ite in mundum universum;

“omnibus, Docete evangelium.” Now these last clauses, we know, were equally spoken to the other apostles, so that the inference from Jewel’s expression would be, that the word “Pascite” was also literally addressed to all. Surely the bishop would have done better, if he had confessed himself to have been guilty of inadvertence, instead of saying in the margin to Harding, “Untruth most vain and manifest.”]

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
i. [iii. 525.]

Hieron. contra Jovinian.
lib. i. [iv.
pt. 2. 168.]

1 Cor. iii. 5.

Chrysost. in
Epist. ad
Galat. cap. i.
[x. 670.]

Chrysost. in
Epist. ad
Tim. ii. hom.
2. [xi. 669.]

quid proprium dixerit, si quid humanum: sed apostolo Christum in se loquentem circumferenti: “We may not believe Paul himself, if he speak any thing of his own, or of worldly reason: but we must believe the apostle bearing about Christ speaking within him.”

Addition.  “This is your own bad stuff,” saith M. Harding p. 162 b. M. Harding, “and proveth nothing.” *The answer.* What stuff it is, how much it weigheth and how well it proveth, I will not strive: but leave the judgment unto the reader. Thus much, I trow, at least it proveth: “That the church was equally built upon all the apostles,” as well upon James or John, as upon St. Peter: for so saith St. Hierom. And that “Christ’s words spoken as unto Peter were common to all:” for so saith Origen. This, M. Harding, was my purpose to prove: and this I thought had been sufficient. It proveth, that in the apostleship Peter and Paul, and the rest of the apostles, were all one: and so one of them not so far inferior to another as is imagined. It proveth, that Peter and Paul, as touching their persons and offices of planting and watering, were both nothing. For so saith St. Paul: “He that planteth is nothing, and 1 Cor. iii. 7. he that watereth is nothing.” And what great difference in dignity can you find, M. Harding, between nothing and nothing? if Peter, that chosen vessel that planted Christ’s church, be nothing, what then is he, that hath rooted up all things, and planteth nothing? 

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis.* 5.

And, as St. Hierom saith, all bishops wheresoever Ad Evagri-
um. [iv. pt.
2. 803.] they be, be they at Rome, be they at Eugubium, be they at Constantinople, be they at Rhegium, be all of like preeminence, and of like priesthood. And, as Cyprian saith, There is but one bishopric, and a De Simpl.
Praelator. [p.
195.] piece thereof is perfectly and wholly holden of every particular bishop.

M. HARDING.

The interpreter, not without the will and advice of this de- Untruth.
Read the
answer. fender, hath altered the sense of the Latin, as the author of the Latin hath altered the words of St. Hierom. For neither speaketh

[Vol. iv. p.
17.]

St. Hierom of bishops in the plural number, neither saith the Latin Apology that the bishops be all of like preeminence, which this translation hath, but of the same merit, and of the same priesthood. With the word "preeminence" guilefully shifted into the sentence in place of this word "merit," these false players thought to win the game. That is, that all bishops, after the mind of St. Hierom, be of like preeminence, and so that all be of like power and authority, and none above other.

Hierom's
place dis-
cussed.

a This was
no part of
the question.

b Untruth.
For the bi-
shop of Rome
is equal with
the other
four patri-
archs, as
shall appear.

Concerning the place alleged, St. Hierom in an epistle to Evagrius, speaking against that a particular custom of the church of Rome should prejudicate the authority of the whole world, in preferring deacons before priests, compareth bishops of great cities and little towns together, and saith, That as touching the honour, dignity, and power of bishoply order and office, and of priesthood, as good and as great a bishop in that respect is the one as the other: and that the bishop of Eugubium and Rhegium, two little towns in Italy, and of Thebes another little town in Egypt, are bishops and priests, and have as great a merit in regard of any their virtues, and as great power concerning the order of priesthood, as the bishops of Rome, of Constantinople, of Alexandria. Yet as touching power and authority of regiment, the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antiochia be above bishops of other diocesses, and the bishop of Rome, Peter's successor, is ^babove all. For we being many are one body in Christ, and every man among ourselves one another's members. "This knot requireth a mutual consent of the whole body, but chiefly the concord of priests: among whom although dignity be not common to them all, yet order is general," as Leo writeth. For even among the most blessed apostles, saith he, in likeness of honour there was odds of power. And whereas the election of them all was equal, yet to one was it given to be over the rest. Out of which plat rose the distinction also of bishops, and with great providence it hath been disposed that all should not take all upon them, but that in every province there should be one who might first give his sentence among his brethren: and again, that in the great cities some should be ordained for taking upon them matters of greater care, through whom the charge of the universal church should have course to the one see of Peter, and that nothing should ever dissent from the head.

Epist. 84. [l. 443.]

Among
bishops is
difference of
power with
likeness of
honour.

c Untruth.
For Christ
never gave
the pope any
such charge.

d Untruth.
For Christ
never gave
such order.

How great and honourable soever the room is that any bishop is placed in, be he archbishop, metropolitan, primate, patriarch, or pope himself: he is no more a bishop than any other of those who occupy the lowest room. The diversity consisteth in this, that they are called to part of charge in sundry proportions, as the bishoprics are greater or lesser: the pope hath committed unto him ^cthe charge of the whole fold of Christ, and hath the fulness of power. For if all were of like power, as these defenders teach, unity could not be maintained. Wherefore ^dby very order of Christ himself it hath been ordained, that matters touching faith and religion, at least such as be weighty, be referred to

The diversity
between bi-
shops, where-
in it consist-
eth.

that one prince of pastors, who sitteth in the chair of Peter the highest bishop, which hath ealways been done and observed from the apostles' time to our days by catholics, and not seldom also by heretics.

^e Untruth.
For it hath
not always
been observ-
ed.

The sentence that this defender allegeth out of St. Cyprian, it seemeth he understood it not. Ye say, That a piece of that one bishopric is perfectly and wholly holden of every particular bishop. But what mean ye by that? if by this word *in solidum*, "perfectly and wholly holden," ye mean that every particular bishop is a bishop without depending of any other, then ye speak against the words ye bring out of St. Cyprian. Who saith: "That as there are many beams of one sun, many boughs of one root, many rivers of one fountain: so there are many bishops of one bishopric. Therefore this bishopric is unto particular bishops, as the sun, as the root, as the fountain." ^f What the fountain, root, and sun of this bishopric is, St. Cyprian declareth a little before, shewing that it was said to Peter: "To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." And, "Feed my sheep."

^f Untruth
without any
likelihood
or regard of
truth.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here M. Harding chargeth us with two of his own common faults: first with corruption: next with ignorance: with corruption in the words and sense of St. Hierom: with ignorance in the place of St. Cyprian. But if we be able sufficiently and truly to answer both, I trust M. Harding shall have no great cause much to vaunt himself, either of his plain dealing herein, or of his knowledge.

And here, to dissemble these childish cavillations of the altering of numbers, the singular into the plural: and of the changing of this word "merit" into this word "preeminence:" which great fault, if it were any, by M. Harding's own confession, proceeded only from the interpreter, and not from the author: I say, to dissemble and to pass by all these silly quarrels, what St. Hierom meant hereby, Erasmus, a man of great learning and judgment, expoundeth thus: *Hieronymus æquare videtur omnes episcopos inter se, perinde quasi omnes ex æquo apostolis successerint. Nec putat ullum episcopum alio minorem esse, quod sit humilior: aut majorem, quod sit opulentior. Nam æquat Eugubiensem episcopum cum Romano. Deinde non putat episcopum quovis presbytero præstantiorem esse, nisi quod jus habeat ordinandi:* "Hierom seemeth to match all bishops to-

Erasmus in
Schol. in
Epist. ad
Evangelum.

gether, as if they were all ‘equally’ the apostles’ successors. And he thinketh not any bishop to be less than other, for that he is poorer : or greater than other, for that he is richer. For he maketh the bishop of Eugubium” (a poor town) “ ‘equal’ with the bishop of Rome. And farther he thinketh, that a bishop is no better than any priest, saving that the bishop hath authority to order ministers.”

M. Harding,
164 a.

Addition. ¶ Hereto M. Harding answereth thus : *Addition.*

“Erasmus saith within five lines following, that the metropolitan hath a certain dignity and jurisdiction above other bishops. Take the one,” saith he, “with the other.”

The answer. I am contented, M. Harding, Erasmus saith, The metropolitan had a dignity above other bishops : but he saith not, The bishop of Rome had jurisdiction over all bishops throughout the world. In St. Hierom’s time there were metropolitans, archbishops, archdeacons, and others. But Christ appointed not these distinctions of orders from the beginning. These names are not found in all the scriptures. This is the thing that we defend. St. Hierom

Hieron. in
Epist. ad
Titum cap. i.
[iv. p. 415.]

saith : *Sciant* [leg. *noverint*] *episcopi*, &c. : “Let bishops understand” (whereunto we add further, Let the bishops of Rome themselves understand) “that they are in authority over priests more by custom than by order of God’s truth.” These be St. Hierom’s words truly translated.

What he meant thereby I leave to the judgment of the reader. Erasmus likewise saith in the selfsame place above alleged : *Quod episcopo minus tribuit dignitatis*, &c. :

Erasmus in
Schol. in
Epist. ad
Evangelum.

“Whereas St. Hierom yieldeth less dignity and authority unto bishops than nowadays they seem to have, we must understand he spake of that time wherein he lived. If he had seen our bishops that now be, he would have said otherwise.” For now the pope claimeth a power above all the powers in heaven and earth, as it is written in the

Sub Leone,
sessione 10.
[Harduin.
ix. 1789.]

Erasmus in
Apologia ad
Pium.

council of Lateran. Again Erasmus in another place speaking hereof, saith thus : *Sanctus vir ingenue fatetur, episcopum Romanum non esse cæteris episcopis sublimiorem sacerdotio, sed tantum opibus* : “This holy man St. Hierom

saith plainly, and freely, and as he thinketh, that the bishop of Rome is above other bishops, not by bishopric, but only by riches.” By his riches only, M. Harding, Erasmus

saith the pope is above other bishops. By riches only, he saith, not by right of God's word, not by virtue, not by learning, not by diligence in preaching: but only by riches. Now it may please you to follow your own rule, and to lay the one saying to the other. ➡

But St. Hierom's words are plain of themselves, and have no need of other expositor. Thus he writeth: *Quid facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat? nec altera Romanæ urbis ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Gallia [leg. Galliæ], et Britannia [leg. Britannicæ], et Aphrica, et Persis, et Oriens, et India, et omnes barbaræ nationes unum Christum adorant: unam observant regulam veritatis. SI AUTHORITAS QUÆRITUR, orbis major est urbe. Ubiunque fuerit episcopus, [sive Romæ,] sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, [sive Rhegii,] sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanai [leg. Tanis], ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt. Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem?* "What doth a bishop, saving only the ordering of ministers, but a priest may do the same? Neither may we think that the church of Rome is one, and the church of all the world beside is another. France, England, Africa, Persia, Levant, India, and all the barbarous nations worship one Christ, and keep one rule of the truth. IF WE SEEK FOR AUTHORITY, the whole world is greater than the city of Rome. Wheresoever there be a bishop, be it at Eugubium, be it at Rome, be it at Constantinople, be it at Rhegium, be it at Alexandria, be it at Tanais, they are all of one worthiness, they are all of one bishopric. The power of riches and the baseness of poverty, maketh not a bishop either higher or lower. For they are all the apostles' successors. What bring you me the custom of Rome, 'being but one city?'"

Hieronym.
ad Evange-
lium. [iv. pt.
2. p. 803.]

Addition. ➡ Here M. Harding findeth great fault, for that I have translated these words, *ejusdem sacerdotii*, "of one bishopric," and not, as he would have it, "of one priesthood." God wot, a very simple quarrel. Let him take whether he liketh best, if either other of these words

Erasmus
adv. Albert.
Pium.

shall serve his turn. Erasmus saith: *Id temporis idem erat episcopus, sacerdos, et presbyter*: "These three names at that time were all one." ➡

Now, if M. Harding will steal away in the dark, as his manner is, and say that St. Hierom spake only of the merit of life, or of the office of priesthood, let some man tell him that this was no part, neither of the question moved, nor of the answer of St. Hierom. And St. Hierom in plain and express words saith: *SI AUTHORITAS QUÆRITUR*: "IF WE SEEK" (not for merit of life, but) "FOR AUTHORITY IN GOVERNMENT, therein the whole world is greater than the city of Rome." M. Harding imagineth, St. Hierom spake only of I know not what: but St. Hierom himself saith, he speaketh namely of "authority."

And whereas M. Harding is so highly offended with the changing of this word "merit" into this word "preeminence:" and saith farther, that these false players thought thereby to win the game: it may please him to remember, that howsoever the game go, St. Hierom himself plainly played the selfsame game: I mean, that St. Hierom using this word "merit," without question meant "preeminence," and not merit of life. For thus he saith: *Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem episcopum non facit*: "The power of riches and the baseness of poverty maketh not a bishop higher or lower." M. Harding might easily have seen, that "higher" and "lower" pertain not to "merit" of life, but to "preeminence." Therefore let him look better upon his book, before he thus lightly condemn others of corruption.

I grant, it is true, as M. Harding saith, this quarrel first began about a particular custom of the church of Rome, whereas the deacons vaunted themselves, and would be placed above the priests. But here M. Harding, as his manner is, willingly dissembleth, and suppresseth somewhat. St. Augustine more lively and fully expresseth the same. For thereof he writeth thus: *Quidam qui nomen habet Falcidii, duce stultitia, et Romanæ civitatis jactantia, Levitus sacerdotibus, et diaconos presbyteris coæquare con-*

Augustin. in
Quest. Veteris et Novi
Testamenti,
quest. 101.
[iii. append.
p. 92.]

tendit : “One Falcidius, foolishness and the pride of the city of Rome leading him thereto, laboureth to make the deacons equal with the priests⁷⁶.”

This lewd disorder St. Hierom controlleth by the examples of other churches, and saith, that therein the authority of the whole world is greater than the authority of the church of Rome : of which also he seemeth to speak scornfully, and with some disdain. For thus he saith : *Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem* : “What bring you me the custom of” (Rome, being but) “one city?” By which words it seemeth, he made small account of the city of Rome.

But M. Harding saith, The primates had authority over other inferior bishops. I grant they had so. Howbeit, they had it by agreement and custom, but neither by Christ, nor by Peter or Paul, nor by any right of God’s word. St. Hierom saith : *Noverint episcopi se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere ecclesiam regere* : “Let bishops understand, that they are above priests rather of custom than of any truth or right of Christ’s institution : and that they ought to rule the church altogether.” And again : *Idem ergo est presbyter, qui episcopus : et antequam diaboli instinctu studia in religione fierent, et diceretur in populis, EGO SUM PAULI, EGO APOLLO, EGO CEPHÆ, communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur* : “Therefore a priest and a bishop are both one thing : and, before that by the inflaming of the devil, parts were taken in religion, and these words were uttered among the people, I HOLD OF PAUL, I HOLD OF APOLLO, I HOLD OF PETER, the churches were governed by the common advice of the priest.” St. Augustine saith : *Secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, episcopatus presbyterio major est* : “The office of a bishop is above the office of a priest” (not by authority of the scriptures, but) “after the names of honour, which the custom of the church hath now obtained.”

Hieron. in
Epist. ad
Titum cap. i.
[iv. 413.]

Hieron. eodem loco.
[ibid.]

Augustin.
epist. 19.
[cap. 4. ii.
302.]

⁷⁶ [The Quæstiones Vet. et Nov. Test. are not now considered genuine.]

ff. lib. 2. de
Jurisdiet.
omnium Ju-
dicum.

As for pope Leo, his own authority in his own cause cannot be great. The emperor saith: *Qui jurisdictioni præest, non debet sibi jus dicere*: "No judge may minister law unto himself." And it is noted thus in the decrees:

16. quæst. 6.
Consuetudo.
In margine.

Papa non debet esse judex in causa propria: "The pope may not be judge in his own cause."

M. Harding,
p. 168 b.

Addition. ☞ And whose cause pleadeth he but his own? *Addition.*

It is the church's cause, saith M. Harding. But the church hath evermore repined against it. St. Basil saith:

Basil. ad Eu-
seb. epist. 8.
[*leg. epist.*
to. iii. 368.]

Quid auxilii nobis conferet occidentalium fastus? "What good shall the pride of the western church do us?"

Noting thereby, as we may reasonably conjecture, the immoderate pride of the church of Rome. St. Bernard in

Bernard. de
Considera.
lib. 3. [ii.
433-437.]

like sort chargeth pope Eugenius: *Ambitio per te in ecclesia regnare molitur.....Murmur loquor et querimoniam communem ecclesiarum. Truncari se clamant, et demembrari*: "Pride striveth through thee to reign in the church.

I speak of the murmuring and common complaint of churches. They complain, they be maimed and dismembered." Whosoever shall consider, how the popes have enriched themselves by the spoils of others, he shall easily judge, whether they have sought their own, or the things that pertain to Christ Jesu. ☞

It is well known, that the pope hath sought for, and claimed this universal authority these many hundred years. Pope Cælestinus was therefore reprov'd of pride and

worldly lordliness by the whole council of Africa.

Concil. Afric.
cap. 105.
[Mansi iv.
516.] super-
bum sæculi
typhum.

Addition. ☞ Where I say pope Cælestinus was re- *Addition.*

prov'd by the whole council of Africa of pride and lordliness, M. Harding thinketh I understand not the place.

And therefore he hath taken upon him to open it better:

but so as they do, that go only by guess. "It seemeth,"

M. Harding,
170 a.

saith he, "that the pope had sent his agents to require temporal aid of the nobles in Africa. Which thing now is called, *Implorare brachium sæculare*. And this is it, that misliked the council. Therefore they say to the pope, We

Potentibus.

beseech you, send not your clerks, *quibuscunque potentibus*,

77 [Basil. ad Euseb. ἐὰν ἐπιμείνη ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ποία βοήθεια ἡμῖν τῆς δουτικῆς ὀφρῦος;]

that is, 'to any of the great men,' lest we seem to bring the smoky stoutness of the temporality into the church of Christ." By this favourable construction he dischargeth the pope and his clergy of pride and stateliness, and conveyeth over the same unto the nobles, only upon occasion of these words, *quibuscunque potentibus*. And therefore he saith: "Whether M. Jewel understood this place or no, I have good cause to doubt." And yet there appeareth no such great difficulty in the matter, but that a mean learned man may understand it well enough with small study. Notwithstanding, M. Harding, whether you understand this place or no, M. Jewel hath no cause to doubt. For indeed you understand it not. The over great favour you bear the pope, in smoothing his faults whatsoever, and the blind error of Peter Crabbe⁷⁸, that compiled the Councils, hath foully beguiled you. For the true copies have not *quibuscunque potentibus*, as you imagine, but *quibuscunque petentibus*, as you might have learned by Theodorus Balsamon, printed at Paris *anno* 1561, and by the words of the said epistle written in Greek. For thus it is written: Ἐκβιβαστὰς τοίνυν κληρικοὺς ὑμῶν τινῶν αἰτούντων μὴ θέλετε ἀποστέλλειν. τινῶν αἰ-
τούντων. These words, as you know, signify not "lords and governors," but "suppliants and suiters." But, M. Harding, is this the grammercy ye yield the prince? when ye call upon him for aid and assistance, will ye say, he is proud and stately, and bringeth vain stoutness and stateliness into the church? Verily the prince defending the church might seem to deserve some greater thanks. I doubt whether there were ever such pride and lordliness in any prince worldly, as hath been found and seen in sundry popes. The pope admitteth the emperor of Christendom to hold his stirrup, to lead his bridle, to bear his train, to kiss his foot. No emperor ever received such service of the pope. Doubtless, M. Harding, the council of Africa meant the stoutness of the clergy, and not of the nobles: the pride of Rome, and not of Africa. This same is it that, as it is said before, St. Basil calleth

Basil. ad Euseb. epist. 8.
[leg. epist.
10. iii. 368.]

⁷⁸ [It is observable that the reading in Mansi's edition of the Concilia is "potentibus."]

occidentalium episcoporum fastum. But you, M. Harding, have turned *petentes* into *potentes*, that is to say, “poor suiters” into great “noblemen.” And to shift the pope from note of stateliness, ye have imagined a long commentary of your own, ye wiss a great way beside the text. ☞

Inter Decret.
Bonifacii 2.

Pope Bonifacius II. condemned St. Augustine and all the said whole council of Africa, and called them all heretics and schismatics for the same, and said, they were all ^aled by the devil.

a Instigante
Diabolo.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding saith : That pope Bonifacius II. *Addition.* condemned that blessed father St. Augustine by name, or the council of Africa by solemn sentence, it is an impudent lie. *The answer.* These words be ordinary, M. Harding, and therefore move me but little. But what talk you of condemning by “name,” or by “solemn sentence?” I say : “Pope Boniface the Second condemned St. Augustine.” You add “name” and “sentence” of your own. They are not mine. But whether he condemned St. Augustine or no, the indifferent reader may easily judge.

Epist. Boni-
facii 2. ad
Eulaliū.
[Mansi viii.
732.]

His words be these : “Aurelius, sometime the bishop of Carthage, began with other his fellow bishops, by the enticing or leading of the devil, to be proud and arrogant against the church of Rome⁷⁹.” Here is Aurelius condemned with his fellows. But who were his fellows, M. Harding? who sat with him in council? who were partners of his pride against the church of Rome? why carry you this away so closely in a cloud? Verily you know right well, and cannot choose but know, that St. Augustine was one of that company, together with Alypius Restitutus, and two hundred and fourteen bishops besides, as appeareth by their epistle unto Bonifacius I. In the subscriptions of every of these councils, of Carthage, of Milevitum, and of Africa, you may find these words : *Ego Augustinus episcopus Hipponensis subscripsi.* You see therefore, that pope Boniface II. condemned not only Aurelius the archbishop of Carthage, but also the great learned father St. Augustine, and two hundred and fourteen other

Concil. Afric.
p. 518.
[Mansi iv.
513 c.]

⁷⁹ [This epistle, ascribed to Bonifacius II., is now ascertained to be spurious. See the note in Mansi.]

his fellow bishops, that sat with him in council, and that above one hundred years after they were dead. But you say : “ Bonifacius condemned them not for schismatics.” I grant, by any such express words he condemneth them not. Perhaps he condemned them for good catholics. Certainly he divided them from the communion of the church : and for so much he condemned them as schismatics. Heretics indeed he calleth them not. And yet pope Nicolas saith : *Qui Romanæ*, &c. : “ Whoso seeketh to make void the privilege of the church of Rome, falleth into heresy.” For he breaketh the faith, whosoever withstandeth the church of Rome, that is the mother of faith. This, M. Harding, is it that pope Bonifacius meant, when he said : “ Aurelius, St. Augustine, and two hundred other learned and godly bishops in the council of Africa, were led by the devil.” Dist. 22.
Omnes.

The pretty nice difference that M. Harding here imagineth between “ enticing ” and “ leading ” is not worthy of answer. For no pope was ever so cruel to condemn a man for that he was enticed, but only for that he yielded, and was led by the devil. ➡

Pope Zosimus, to maintain this claim, corrupted the holy council of Nice. Hilary the bishop of Vienna and other learned bishops of France, for usurping such unlawful authority, charged this same pope Leo of whom we speak, with pride and ambition.

Addition. ➡ And therefore thus Leo complaineth of him : *Ipsius quoque beatissimi Petri reverentiam verbis arrogantioribus minuit* : “ By his arrogant words he abaseth the reverence of the most blessed Peter himself.” By this reverence due unto Peter, he meant the reverence that he claimed to himself : for doubtless M. Harding himself cannot think that Hilary’s quarrel was against Peter the apostle of Christ, now reigning in heaven. It was only against that inordinate ambition and pride of Peter’s successors, that even then sought to rule over the whole church of God. ➡ Leo, epist. 89,
[1. 429.]

But, gentle reader, that thou mayest the better understand what credit thou oughtest to give to this pope Leo,

specially setting forth his own authority, I beseech thee consider with what majesty of words, and how far above measure he advanceth the authority of St. Peter. These

Leo, epist. 89. be his words: *Christus Petrum in consortium individuae*
[i. 429.] *unitatis assumpsit*: "Christ received Peter into the com-

Leo, epist. 52. pany of the indivisible unity⁷⁹. *Auctoritate Domini mei*
[i. 584.] *Petri apostoli*: "By the authority" (not of Christ, but)

Leo, epist. 89. "of my lord Peter the apostle:" *Deo inspirante et bea-*
[i. 433.] *tissimo Petro apostolo*: "By the inspiration of God, and of

Leo in eadem St. Peter the apostle." *Deus a Petro, velut a quodam*
Epist. [i. capite, dona sua velut [al. velit] in corpus omne diffudit [al.
428.] *manare*]: "God from Peter, as from the head, hath poured

Leo in Sermon out his gifts into all the body." *Nihil erit ligatum aut*
de Natali Petri et Pauli. *solutum, nisi quod Petrus ligaverit aut solverit*: "There
[i. 109.] shall be nothing bound or loosed, but that Peter shall bind

Leo in Sermon or loose⁸⁰." *Nunc quoque Petrus pascit oves, et mandatum*
3. in Anniversario die Assumptionis. [i. 109.] *Domini pius pastor exequitur*: "Even now Peter feedeth the sheep, and as a godly shepherd he fulfilleth the commandment of his master." Such immoderate and ambitious dignity Leo was content to yield to Peter, to the end that the possession and fruit thereof might redound wholly unto himself.

M. Harding,
174 a.

Addition. ☞ But all these sayings, M. Harding, you Addition.
say, may well be justified. Touching the first, whereas pope Leo saith, "Christ took Peter into the fellowship of his indivisible unity," your answer is this, "Leo meant thereby an unity in quality, an unity in grace, an unity that is proper to Christ himself. But the indivisible unity in substance" (you say) "he meant not. And yet, this" (you say) "was my devilish meaning." In good faith, M. Harding, you do me wrong: I never meant it. But thus I say: Give these words of pope Leo the most favourable construction you can devise, yet may not the same

⁷⁹ [See vol. ii. 310, and vol. iv. 372, note. Here the ed. of 1570 has the true reading "unitatis:" whereas that of 1567 reads "Trinitatis." It is singular, that Harding in his Detection takes no notice of the mistake.]

⁸⁰ [Leo in Sermon de Natali Petri et Pauli. This sermon is spurious, but the substance of it, and the passage quoted by Jewel, will be found in sermon 3. in Anniversario die Assumptionis (next reference). See vol. i. p. 109.]

reasonably be applied to any creature: no not unto the blessed angels and archangels of God. You cannot say, they are in the fellowship of Christ's unity. I grant, "Peter is called the rock." So is John, so is James, so are the rest. The learned father Origen saith: *Petra est, quisquis est discipulus Christi*: "Whosoever is Christ's disciple, he is the rock." Will you say therefore, M. Harding, that Christ received Peter to be his fellow, and his fellow in unity? and that in such unity as might never be dissolved? Wherefore then doth Christ immediately after call him Satan? For thus he said unto Peter: "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou understandest not the things that are of God." Shall we say, that, being Satan, he was nevertheless in the fellowship of Christ's unity? Indeed friar Ambrosius Catharinus in his late declamation openly pronounced in the council of Trident, calleth the blessed Virgin our lady, *fidelissimam Christi sociam*: "Christ's most faithful fellow." And you, M. Harding, upon warrant of Bernard's words, have no doubt to say: "The pope by power is Peter: and by anointing is Christ⁸¹." This, I trow, is enough. "The pope is Peter: the pope is Christ." "Yet all this," you say, "is well spoken, and may be justified."

Leo saith further: "Christ called Peter the rock, that the building of the everlasting temple might stand in the soundness of Peter." Alas, M. Harding, and must this likewise be justified as the rest? is this the building of the church of God? We are built upon Christ, and not upon Peter. Christ is the rock, that standeth for ever. St. Paul saith: "No man can lay other foundation, than that is already laid, which is Christ Jesus."

Howbeit, I deny not, but in some reasonable kind of speech, Peter also may be called the "rock:" but so, as Paul, and James, and John, and all other the apostles of Christ may likewise be called, and none otherwise. Origen saith: "The words of Christ spoken as unto Peter, were common to all." So likewise St. Hierom, notwithstanding he call Peter the head or principal of the apostles, yet he saith: *Ecclesia fundatur super omnes apostolos. Ex æquo*

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
i. [iii. 524.]

Matt. xvi. 23.

Council. Tri-
dent. [Crabb.
iii. 988.]

M. Harding's
Confutation,
fol. 210 a.

Leo, epist. 89.
[i. 429.]
Ut æterni
ædificatio
templi in
Petri solidi-
tate consiste-
ret.

1 Cor. x. 4.
1 Cor. iii. 11.

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
i. [iii. 525.]
Hieronym.
adv. Jovinianum, lib. 1.
[iv. pt. 2.
168.]
Ex æquo.

⁸¹ [See vol. ii. 309. note ¹¹.]

super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidatur : “ The church is built upon all the apostles : the strength of the church is founded” (not only upon Peter, but) “ ‘equally’ upon them all. Upon them all,” he saith, “ the church is built, and that ‘equally,’ ” that is to say, no more upon Peter than upon the rest⁸¹. What vanity then is it, M. Harding, to apply that thing only or specially unto one, that is equally common unto so many ?

You say : “ Christ being himself the rock, gave the same title unto Peter : therefore Leo might justly say, Christ received Peter into the fellowship of his indivisible unity.” This argument hangeth very loosely, as it shall appear.

John viii. 12.

Matt. v. 14.

For Christ likewise saith of himself : “ I am the light of the world.” And yet he saith to his disciples : “ You are the light of the world,” giving them that name that was proper and peculiar to himself. Shall we therefore say, Christ took all his disciples into the fellowship of his indivisible unity ? if so, where then is Peter’s privilege ? or what hath Peter above the rest ? or how can these words of pope Leo be excused ? It is too ambitious, M. Harding : it is too much. No learned father ever gave St. Peter the like title. Justify no more than may well be justified.

Leo, epist. 89.
[i. 433.]

Again Leo saith : *Deo inspirante, et beatissimo Petro apostolo* : “ By the inspiration of God, and of the most blessed St. Peter the apostle ?”

M. Harding,
176 a.

Here, M. Harding, in defence of these unsavoury words, unadvisedly uttered by pope Leo, you have used such unmannerly and unmanly speech, as may become no man but only yourself. Though I had misconceived pope Leo, and taken him otherwise than he meant, as you have often the holy fathers, yet sobriety and gravity had been fitting and seemly for a doctor.

M. Harding,
176 a.

“ Much talk you move of the preposition A, first placed, and after repeated, and yet not expressed : of the ablative case ruled, and of the ablative case absolute :” and so you lead the simple along in the dark, he woteth not whither : but indeed you have purposely

⁸¹ [Hieron. advers. Jovinian.
“ At dicis super Petrum fundatur
“ ecclesia ; licet id ipsum in alio
“ loco super omnes apostolos fiat,
“ et cuncti claves regni cœlorum

“ accipiant ; et ex æquo super eos
“ ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur : ta-
“ men inter duodecim unus eligi-
“ tur ; ut capite constituto schis-
“ matis tollatur occasio.”]

corrupted and mispointed the whole place, as it may easily appear to any man that shall compare your book and Leo's epistles both together. For Leo hath two commates between these words, *apostolo* and *decreta sunt*, and readeth thus, as in all the books that I have read, it is easy to see: *Obtestamur,.....ut ea, quæ a nobis*⁸², *Deo inspirante, et beatissimo Petro apostolo, discussis, probatisque nunc omnibus causis, decreta sunt, servetis*. By which manner of pointing, it may appear to any man that is able to judge, that these words, *Deo inspirante, et beatissimo Petro apostolo*, are governed by one rule of construction, and go together: as if in plainer sort the whole sentence were laid thus: *Obtestamur, ut servetis ea, quæ discussis, probatisque omnibus causis, decreta sunt a nobis, Deo inspirante, et beatissimo Petro apostolo*: "We beseech you, to keep those things, which, all causes being discussed and proved, have been decreed by us, by the inspiration of God, and the most blessed Peter the apostle." Neither is there any grammarian, that, the points thus standing, as they be in all books both printed and written, can expound it otherwise.

Now, M. Harding, behold Leo's words, as you have stalled them. Thus you write: *Obtestamur, ut ea, quæ a nobis Deo inspirante, et beatissimo Petro apostolo decreta sunt, servetis*. Marry, now it is as you would have it: but yet is it nothing, as Leo left it. Lay these places together: view your words again. Where is the comma after this word *apostolo*? where is the other comma after this word *causis*? why have you brought these words *apostolo* and *decreta sunt* so near together? could you cut off two commates together in one place, and so cunningly beguile your simple reader? Indeed ye were ashamed of the error: the sense was blasphemous, you thought it most wisdom to leave out the points, and to alter your book, and to shift away blasphemy by plain corruption. I would never have made so great account of so simple reckonings, had not you, M. Harding, given the occasion.

Howbeit, let us yield unto you, and contrary to the credit of all your books printed or written, new or old, let

⁸² [In the edition of the Ballerini, tom. i. 641, there is no comma after "nobis."]

us follow your own reading, and say thus : *Obtestamur, ut servetis ea, quæ decreta sunt a nobis, et beatissimo Petro apostolo* : beware ye fall not from one error into another. Here first the pope placeth himself before St. Peter. For thus he saith : " It is decreed by me, and by St. Peter." This perhaps is no great blasphemy. It may rather seem to be some lack of good manner. Yet is it not likely that Leo, being so holy a man, as M. Harding imagineth, no, though he were never so much ambitious, would set St. Peter behind, and himself before. That had been enough for pope Alexander III. who, when he had set his foot in Fredericus the emperor's neck, and the emperor had told him that he yielded that honour not unto him being pope, but unto Peter : " yes," said the pope, *Et mihi et Petro* : " Thou shalt stoop to me, and to Peter : " giving the first place unto himself⁸¹.

Carion, in
Vita Alex-
and. 3.

Besides this, by M. Harding's construction Leo imagineth, that St. Peter is always present with the pope, and sitteth with him in consistory or in closet, discussing of cases, and devising of laws. I will not say that this is blasphemy. Perhaps I may think it is great folly. For what part of Peter is it, that sitteth there? His soul is in heaven, his body in the grave. If he be there neither in soul nor in body, how is he there? or, if St. Peter be there, and that in such order that he is able to hear causes, to make decrees, and to govern the church, what need hath he then of any successor? A " successor " hath no place while the " predecessor " is present. By such fables, M. Harding, and outrage of speech, ye abuse the poor people, and bear them in hand, that, whatsoever is done by the pope, it is done by St. Peter.

Confutation,
p. 192 b.

But, if Peter be yet still in Rome, and make laws now as when he was living, wherefore then, M. Harding, have you written thus in your late Confutation : " Christ now requireth us, not to obey Peter and Paul, but him that sitteth in their chair ? " These be your words : you may not

⁸¹ [Raumer, (Geschichte der Hohenstaufen, vol. ii. p. 252,) with other modern Germans, considers this story to be groundless ;

but he adds that, so late as the time of pope Pius IV., pictures were to be seen in the Vatican representing these indignities.]

forget them. If St. Peter be now in Rome, and make laws for you, as you say, how can you say: "You are not bound to obey him?" If ye be not bound to obey him, how can you tell us, he maketh your laws? Certainly it is meet, that the lawmaker be ever obeyed. But we must pardon you, M. Harding: ye walk in the dark, and say, and unsay, ye know not what.

In the life of this Leo it is written thus: "Leo wrote an epistle against the heretic Eutyches, and doubting the ability of his own learning, he laid the same epistle upon Peter's altar, and fasted forty days, and besought St. Peter, that if there were any error therein, he would correct it with his own hands." The fable is true: Peter came down from heaven with pen and ink, as I trow, and corrected it. After the fortieth [*ed.* 1570. fourth] day the epistle was perfect.

Leo himself saith: *Omnes sacerdotes proprie regit Petrus*: "In plain manner of speech, or to speak conveniently, Peter governeth all the priests that be." Again he saith: *Si quid nostris temporibus recte a nobis agitur, Petri gubernaculis est deputandum*: "If in our time any thing be well done by us, we must reckon it as done by Peter's government." Again: "There shall nothing be bound or loosed, but that Peter shall bind or loose⁸²." And again: "Even now Peter feedeth the sheep," &c.

St. Gregory saith: "*Transmisimus vobis de benedictione S. Petri apostoli cucullam, et tunicam*": "I have sent you a cowl and a coat, of the blessing of St. Peter."

Likewise he writeth to Theoctistus [*leg.* Theoctista]: "I have sent thee St. Peter's blessing, I mean a key taken from his blessed body....., that by that same key you may have life, both present and everlasting." Now, M. Harding, if St. Peter can sit with the pope, write letters, discuss causes, govern priests, rule the church, feed the flock, bless cowls, coats, and keys, and bind, and loose, why may he not also inspire the faithful?

Take heed, in shunning one blasphemy ye commit not another. Shift pope Leo's words as you shall think best:

⁸² [This Sermon 2, in Natal. Petri et Pauli, is spurious, but the sentence quoted is found in the

serm. 3. in Annivers. Assumptionis suæ.]

In Vita Leon.
Ut ille suis
manibus cor-
rectum ab-
solveret.

Leo in Anni-
versario die
Assumptio-
nis suæ,
serm. 3. [l.
108.]
In eodem
Serm. [l.
109.]

Leo in Natali
Petri et Pauli,
serm. 2. [l.
109.]

Leo in Anni-
versario die
Assumptio-
nis suæ. [l.
109.]

Gregor. lib.
8. epist. 45.
[ii. 1094.]

Gregor. lib. 6.
epist. 23.
[Theoctistæ
Patriciæ. ii.
872.]

Ut per eam
vos, qui eum
timetis et
di.igitis, et
præsentem
salutem
et æternam
habere va-
leatis.

whatsoever sense ye shall pick out of them, it will be blasphemy. ☞

Some others have thought, that as well these epistles of Leo, as also others mo, of other the ancient bishops of Rome, have been interlaced and falsified by the ambitious popes that followed afterward. Which thing is the more likely, both for that the selfsame words be likewise alleged, partly under the name of pope^a Julius, partly under the name of pope^b Nicolas: and also for that pope Zosimus, which was the fifth before Leo, as it is said before, doubted not, for an advantage, to falsify the holy council of Nice^c. Verily, when the council of Chalcedon had offered unto this same Leo the title of “universal bishop,” as Gregory witnesseth, he utterly refused it, and would none of it^d.

Now touching that St. Hierom saith, the poor bishop of Eugubium and the bishop of Rome are both of one authority (for of authority he speaketh, as it is proved before): St. Cyprian also saith the same, that the authority of the bishops in Africa, is as good as that authority of the bishop of Rome: and called them all lewd and desperate persons, that would, as M. Harding doth, say the contrary.

Therefore, whereas M. Harding saith, By very order of Christ himself it hath been ordained, that matters touching faith and religion be referred to that one prince of pastors, who sitteth on the chair of Peter, the highest bishop, and that the same hath always been done and observed from the apostles’ time until our days: he bringeth us two manifest untruths together, without any manner proof at all, only avouched upon himself. For it appeareth not that Christ ever took this order, or ever made any such mention, either of any such prince of pastors, or of Peter’s chair. And in the council of Africa it was decreed, that no matters should be removed from thence to Rome. The words of the council are these: *Ad transmarina judicia qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiatur*: “Whosoever shall think he ought to appeal to the judgments beyond the sea,” (that is, to the bishop of Rome;) “let no man within Africa receive him to the communion.”

a Epist. Julii
1.

b In 60. de E.
lect. Funda-
menta.

c Concil.
Afric. cap.
105. [leg. cap.
101. iv. §13
a.]

d Gregor. lib.
4. epist. 36.
[ii. 771.]

Cyprian. lib.
1. epist. 3.
[p. 82.]
(Nisi) paucis
[leg. quibus-
dam] despe-
ratis, et per-
ditis.

Concil. Afric.
cap. 92. [iv.
507.]

Touching that M. Harding calleth the pope the prince of pastors, he might have remembered, that the right of this name belongeth only unto Christ. St. Peter saith : "That when Christ the Prince of pastors shall appear, ye may receive the uncorruptible crown." Now to infeoff the pope with Christ's peculiar titles, a man might think it were great blasphemy. Certainly St. Cyprian saith : *Nemo nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit* : "None of us appointeth himself bishop of bishops : " much less the prince of all pastors. And in the council of Constantinople it was decreed, that the bishop there should have even and equal authority with the bishop of Rome.

As for the other authority of St. Cyprian, M. Harding saith, we understood it not : and therefore he willeth us to look better upon our books. The counsel is good. But if M. Harding will grant, that St. Cyprian himself knew what he himself wrote, and understood his own meaning, it shall be sufficient. Verily the words that he useth seem not so dark. For thus he writeth : *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ecclesia una est, quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fœcunditatis extenditur : quomodo solis multi radii, sed lumen unum : et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum* : "The bishopric is one, a part whereof of every several bishop is possessed in whole. The church is one, which by her great increase is extended unto many : as in the sun the beams be many, but the light is one : and in a tree the boughs be many, but the body is one."

If there appear any great darkness or doubt in these words, St. Cyprian himself in other places thus expoundeth his own meaning in plainer wise : *Una est ecclesia a Christo per totum mundum in plura membra divisa : item episcopatus unus, episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus* : "There is one church divided by Christ into many members throughout the world : likewise one bishopric poured far abroad by the agreeable multitude of many bishops." Again : *Ecclesia una est, et connexa, et coherentium sibi invicem sacerdotum glutino copulata* : "There is one church joined and fastened in one, by the consent

¹ Peter. v. 4.
[Vulg.]

In Concil.
Carthag. [i.
973, 974.]

Concil. Con-
stantinop. 2.
cap. 36.
[Quint-Sext.
xi. 960.]

τῶν ἱσων
ἀπολαβεῖν
[i. ἀπολαύ-
ειν] πρεσ-
βείων τοῦ
τῆς πρεσ-
βυτέρας Ῥώ-
μης θρόνου.

Cyprian, de
Simpl. Præ-
lat. [p. 195.]

Cyprian, lib.
4. epist. 2.
[ad Antoni-
anum, p. 73.]

Cyprian, lib.
4. epist. 9.
[ad Florenti-
um, pp. 123,
124.]

Cyprian, in
Orat. Domi-
nica. [p. 206.]

of bishops agreeing together⁸³." Again: *Quando oramus, non pro uno oramus, sed pro toto populo: quia totus populus unum sumus*: "When we pray, we pray not for one, but for the whole people. For we the whole people are but one." Again, immediately before these words, which, M. Harding saith, we are not able to understand, he saith:

Cyprian, de
Simpl. Prie-
lat. [p. 195.]

Hanc unitatem firmiter tenere, et vendicare debemus, maxime episcopi, qui in ecclesia præsidemus: ut episcopatum quoque ipsum unum, et indivisum probemus: "This unity must we hold, specially bishops that sit as rulers in the church: that we may declare our bishopric to be one, and without division." Again: *Etsi pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus: et oves universas, quas Christus sanguine suo, et passione quæsit, colligere, et fovere debemus*: "Notwithstanding we be many shepherds, yet we feed but one flock: and we are all bound to gather up, and to nourish all the sheep, that Christ hath won by his blood and passion."

Cyprian, lib.
3. epist. 13.
[ad Steph.
p. 116.]

If either the author of the Apology or the interpreter understood not St. Cyprian, yet, M. Harding, ye may give St. Cyprian leave to understand himself.

Hieronym.
in Epist. ad
Tit. cap. 1.
[iv. p. 413.]

And in this sense St. Hierom saith: *Communi presbyterorum consilio ecclesiæ gubernabantur*: "The churches were ordered" (not by the universal authority of the bishop of Rome, but) "by common advice of the priests." Like-

Cyprian, lib.
3. epist. 13.
[ad Steph. p.
116.]

wise St. Cyprian saith: *Idcirco.....copiosum est corpus sacerdotum, concordie mutue glutine, atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresim facere, et gregem Christi lacerare, ac vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri*: "Therefore is the body or company of priests so copious, joined together with consent of concord, and unity, that if any one of our company enterprise to raise an heresy, and to scatter and waste the flock of Christ, the

Basil, ad Ne-
ocæsariens.
epist. 75. in
ipso fine.
[iii. 307.]

rest should help." So likewise St. Basil: *Interrogate Patres vestros, et renuntiabunt vobis, quod, etiamsi loci situ divisæ inter se sint paræciæ, tamen veluti coronamento quodam*

⁸³ [Cyprian. ad Florent. "...
"quando ecclesia, quæ catholica
"et una est, scissa non sit neque

"divisa, sed sit utique connexa,
"et cohærentium sibi invicem sa-
"cerdotum glutino copulata."]

unitæ, unaque sententia gubernatæ fuerunt. Assidua quidem populi fuit inter se commixtio :.....ipsi vero pastores tanta præditi fuerunt mutua inter ipsos charitate, ut alius alio præceptore, ac duce usi fuerint : “ Ask of your fathers, and they will tell you, that although bishoprics be divided and sundered by distance of place, yet were they ever knit together as with a garland, and ever ruled by one advice. Indeed the people was ever mingled together : but the bishops were also joined in charity, that every of them was content to be taught and to be led by other.”

Addition.

Addition. ¶ Here, M. Harding, dissembling all other authorities and proofs by me alleged, ye take hold only of St. Basil, seeking means to shadow one plain sentence of that holy father, by the manifest corruption of another. “ St. Basil’s meaning,” you say, “ may best be known by St. Basil himself writing thus to Athanasius : *Visum est utile, scribere ad episcopum Romanum, ut consideret res nostras, et iudicii sui decretum interponat : ut, quoniam de communi, et conciliari decreto aliquos inde huc amandari difficile est, ipse sua autoritate negotium componat :* which whole sentence being by you untruly Latined, it hath pleased you to English thus : “ It hath seemed good unto us, to write unto the bishop of Rome, that he will consider our cases, (or visit us, for so the Greek word ἐπισκέψαι may be translated,) and to determine the matter by his sentence : that, forasmuch as it is hard for any to be sent hither from thence by authority of a common and synodical decree, he take the matter into his own hand, and by his authority strike the stroke⁸⁴.” These be St. Basil’s words, M. Harding, so miserably maimed by you, and so set out of joint, as well in the Latin as in the English, that it is pity to behold them. And yet, as though the case were clear of your side, you say further : “ Why should St. Basil, being a Greek of the east church, think it convenient to write

M. Harding,
fol. 179 b.

[Basil. ad
Athan. epist.
52. tom. iii.
p. 162.]

⁸⁴ [St. Basil. ad Athan.
ἐφάνη δὲ ἡμῖν ἀκολουθοῦν ἐπιστεῖ-
λαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης, ἐπισκέ-
ψασθαι τὰ ἐνταῦθα, καὶ δοῦναι
γνώμην, ἵν’ ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ κοινοῦ καὶ
συνοδικοῦ δόγματος ἀποσταλῇναί
τινας δυσκόλων τῶν ἐκείθεν, αὐτὸν

αὔθεντῆσαι περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἐκλε-
ξάμενον ἄνδρας ἱκανοὺς μὲν ὁδοι-
πορίας πόνοους ὑπενεγκεῖν, ἱκανοὺς
δὲ πραότῃτι, κ. τ. λ. Just above
he had termed St. Athanasius
ὥσπερ κορυφὴν τῶν ὄλων.]

to the bishop of Rome, being in the west, to consider of, or to visit, them of the east," (for so too the Greek word *ἐπισκέψαι*, as you say, signifieth,) "their state, and to send forth a decree of his judgment, and to give sentence, unless he agnised the prerogative of the bishop of Rome?"

M. Harding,
fol. 18o a.

In the end you conclude thus: "The more ye stir the matter, the more it turneth still to your shame." Such is the maidenly modesty of your talk.

You say: "Why should St. Basil desire the bishop of Rome to visit them of the east, to send forth the decree of his judgment, and to give sentence?" Nay, nay, M. Harding, why should you thus allege Greek authors, if you know them not? or if you know them, why should you thus corrupt them? Verily in these few words you have much betrayed your want of skill. First, *δοῦναι γνώμην* you expound thus: "To determine the matter by decree, or by sentence." And why so: doth *δοῦναι* signify to determine? or is *γνώμη* a decree or sentence in judgment? Surely, M. Harding, *δοῦναι γνώμην* is nothing else but to "give advice," or to "aid with counsel." These words, *αὐθεντῆσαι περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα*, you expound thus: "To take the matter into his own hands, and by his authority to strike the stroke." And why so? who taught you this exposition? Every child could have told you that *αὐθεντῆσαι* signifieth neither striking nor stroking. St. Basil's meaning is this: that, forasmuch as a council of all the parts of the west church could not be gathered upon the sudden, and the church of Græcia stood in need of present help, that therefore the bishop of Rome in the mean while should use his own discretion, and entreat some of the western bishops to travel unto them. And so much in this place signifieth the Greek word *αὐθεντῆσαι*.

"But *ἐπισκέψαι*," you say, "signifieth to visit." So doth *bubo* signify "a nightingale." Twice ye have used this word *ἐπισκέψαι* in one place: not only enclosing it in your text, but also pricking it in your margin, that your simple reader might think there were some mystery in your Greek. But I pray you, M. Harding, in all the Greek books that ever you read, where ever saw you *ἐπισκέψαι* in the first indefinite of the infinitive mood? If ye ever once

saw it, I will yield unto you. If you never saw it once, why have you used it twice, and that even together in one place? Ἐπισκέψασθαι ye should have said, M. Harding: ἐπισκέψασθαι it is, and not ἐπισκέψαι. And yet ἐπισκέψασθαι in this place is not to “ride in visitation,” as you imagine, but to consider of the miserable state of the east church, and to be careful for it. The true and common translation is this: *Visum est mihi consentaneum, ut scribatur episcopo Romæ, ut, quæ hic geruntur, consideret, detque consilium*⁸⁵ [ed. 1570, *concilium*]: *et quoniam difficile est, ut communi ac synodico decreto aliqui illinc mittantur, ipse sua autoritate in hac causa usus viros eligat ad ferendas itineris molestias accomodos* [l. *idoneos*]: “It seemeth good unto me, that we write unto the bishop of Rome, that he consider our estate, and give us counsel: and, forasmuch as it is a hard matter for any to be sent hither from thence by the common decree of a council, that he, using his own authority or discretion in the case, choose such men as be able to bear the travail of the journey⁸⁶,” &c.

Now, M. Harding, compare your translation and this together: here is neither visitation of the church, nor determination by sentence, or striking of strokes. Ye could not have missed so oftentimes in one thing without some study. If I listed to follow some part of your eloquence, I could say, Fie, and shame, and I know not what, as you do.

Yet you say: “St. Basil thought it good, that the bishop of Rome should consider their estate, and send forth a decree of his judgment.” O, M. Harding, gross error and ignorance maketh no proof. But be it, that all this were true: yet what decree of judgment could the pope send forth? He had heard neither the one part nor the other, but was a mere stranger to their cases. And think you, he would determine matters before he knew them? So

⁸⁵ [“Detque consilium.” See vol. ii. 233. where bishop Jewel gives the reading “concilium.” The translation shews, that it is an error of the press.]

⁸⁶ [Bishop Jewel quoted probably from the translation of Wolfgang. Musculus. The word “ac-

“commodos” is used later in the same line. The translation published by Cornarius Basil. 1566 begins the sentence thus: “Visum autem est nobis, ut literas ad episcopum Rom. mittamus, quo res hic consideret ac consilium det.”]

Basil. epist. 52. ad Athanas. [iii. 162.]

Basil. epist.
8. ad Euse-
biū. [epist.
10. tom. iii.
368.]

might he cast Christ, and quit Barabbas. Hereof Basil himself writeth thus :*quid auxilii conferet nobis occi-*
dentalium fastus? qui quid in causa veri sit, neque sciunt,
neque discere sustinent: falsis vero suspicionibus præoccu-
pati eadem nunc quoque faciunt, quæ antea in causa Mar-
celli, cum illis, qui veritatem annuntiabant, contentiose
egerunt, et hæresim interea per seipsos corroborarunt. Ego
quidem ipse non publica formula, (sed privatim⁸⁷) volebam
scribere ipsorum coryphæo: de ecclesiasticis quidem rebus
nihil, nisi tantum ut admonerem, ipsos neque veritatem
rerum nostrarum scire, neque viam, qua doceri possint, ad-

The pride of
the west
church.
Neither
know, nor
will learn.

mittere: “What shall the pride of the western bishops
avail us? For neither do they know, nor will they learn to
know, the truth of our matters: but being led away with
vain suspicions, they do even now, as they did before in
the case of Marcellus. For then they caviled contentiously
with them that told the truth, and by mean thereof em-
boldened and confirmed heresy. Indeed for mine own
part, I was contented to write unto the chief or principal
of them all,” (that is, to the pope,) “not by any public
instrument, but mine own private letter. Of matters eccle-
siastical I would write nothing, but only to tell him, that
neither they do know the truth of our cases, nor will abide
the way, whereby they may know it.” This, M. Harding,
is that decree and determination of judgment, St. Basil
found in the pope. Neither did he know the case, nor
would he learn, how to know it. Therefore Chrysostom
saith : *Non est congruum, ut hi, qui sunt in Ægypto, judi-*
cent eos, qui sunt in Thracia: “It is not meet, that they,

Confirmed
heresy.

Chrysostom.
Epist. prior.
ad Innocen-
tium. [iii.
517.]

⁸⁷ [St. Basil. ad Eusebium. ἐὰν
δὲ ἐπιμείνῃ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ποία
βοήθεια ἡμῖν τῆς δυτικῆς ὀφρύνος;
οἱ τὸ ἀληθὲς οὔτε ἴσασιν οὔτε μα-
θεῖν ἀνέχονται, ψευδέσι δὲ ὑπονοί-
αις προειλημμένοι, ἐκεῖνα ποιοῦσι
νῦν, ἃ πρότερον ἐπὶ Μαρκέλλῳ
πρὸς μὲν τοὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῖς
ἀπαγγέλλοντας φιλονεικήσαντες·
τὴν δὲ αἵρεσιν δι' ἑαυτῶν βεβαιώ-
σαντες. ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ αὐτοὺς, ἄνευ
τοῦ κοινοῦ σχήματος, ἐβουλόμην αὐ-
τῶν ἐπιστεῖλαι τῷ κορυφαίῳ. περὶ
μὲν τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν οὐδέν, εἰ μὴ

ὅσον παραινέσθαι, ὅτι οὔτε ἴσασι
τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, οὔτε
τὴν ὁδὸν δι' ἧς ἂν μανθάνοιεν κατα-
δέχονται. It will be seen, that there
are no words in the Greek exactly
answering to the Latin “sed pri-
vatim.” Bishop Jewel found
them in the translation of Wolf-
gang. Muscul. (ed. Basil. 1565);
from which he evidently quotes,
though (probably from trusting
too much to his memory) with
some verbal inaccuracy.]

that be in Egypt, should be judges over them, that dwell in Thracia." St. Cyprian also likewise saith:*æquum*, Cyprian. lib. 1. epist. 3. [ad Cornel. p. 86.]
justumque est, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiat, ubi crimen admissum est..... : "It is good reason, that every man's cause be heard there, where the fault was committed."

But you will say: "St. Basil thought it good to write to the pope." I grant you: but in such sort as I have told you. Again ye say: "Why should Basil so do, unless he knew the privilege of the pope?" How followeth this, M. Harding? will you bear us in hand, that every bishop unto whom St. Basil wrote to like purpose, had therefore the like privilege? At the same time thus he wrote, not only to the pope, but also to all the bishops of the west: *Quantam poteritis consolationem, et opem laborantibus, et afflictis ecclesiis afferre ne detrectetis*: "Fore- M. Harding, p. 179 b.
Basil. ad Episc. Occident. epist. 61. [iii. 181.]
slow not to help our miserable afflicted churches with such aid and comfort as you may." Likewise he writeth to the bishops of France and Italy: "We have good hope, that, as soon as we shall do you to understand the cause of our griefs, you will be moved to seek help for us." Basil. ad Italos et Gallos, epist. 69. [iii. 183 c.]

To like purpose the whole council of Alexandria writeth, not only to the pope, but also to all other bishops of the catholic church:*vos vindices hujus injustitiæ imploramus*: "We beseech you to revenge this wrong." Yet had not therefore every such bishop supreme authority in the government of the church. So writeth St. Basil unto Athanasius: *Quanto ecclesiarum, &c.*: "The more the maladies of our churches do abound, the more we all turn ourselves to thy goodness, believing that the comfort of our griefs resteth only in thy defence. For thou by the power of thy prayers, and by the skill of government, art thought able to deliver us from this horrible tempest.— Thou carriest the care of all churches: thou disputest, thou warnest, thou writest, thou sendest..... We fly unto thee, as unto the head of all: we use thee as our counsellor, and as the leader and prince of our causes.—The whole state of the church of Antioch dependeth of thee. Thou mayest instruct some, repress others, and make them quiet, and

Athanas. in Apolog. p. 378. et 389. [ed. Nann. Basil. 1564.]

Basil. ad Athanas. epist. 49. [iii. 173.]

Basil. ad Athanas. epist. 52. [iii. 162.]
Athanasius head of all.

Basil. ad Athanas. epist. 48. [iii. 159.]

restore the strength of the church." Such power and authority St. Basil giveth to Athanasius. Yet was Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria, and not of Rome. Had you well considered these things, M. Harding, ye would not so rawly have thus concluded: "St. Basil thought it good to write thus and thus to the bishop of Rome: *ergo*, he confessed that the bishop of Rome had a privilege above all others."

All this notwithstanding, you say, "Why should St. Basil think it convenient to write to the bishop of Rome," &c.?

Basil. ad Episc. Occident. epist. 74. [iii. 405.]

The answer is easy. St. Basil himself saith: *Quæ nos loquimur, multis suspecta sunt*, &c.: "Whatsoever we ourselves say, it is suspected of many, as if for our own private quarrels we would keep them in awe. But you" (being strangers) "the further ye dwell from them, the more credit you have with our people." This was it, M. Harding, that St. Basil required of the pope. Here is no universal power, no privilege, no decree, no determination by sentence, no striking of strokes. Advise yourself better hereafter of your authorities, before you allege them. 

Therefore, as many faiths in sundry faithfuls are but one faith: as many churches are but one church: as many baptisms are but one baptism: even so, saith St. Cyprian, many bishoprics are but one bishopric: and therein, as well the bishop of Rome as also every other several bishop, hath his portion.

I say, the bishopric of Rome is not this whole bishopric, but a part: not the body of the sun, but a beam: not the stem of the tree, but a branch.

And thus, by St. Cyprian's mind, neither doth one bishop hold of another: nor is any one bishop head of the whole: nor is one bishop all in all: but all bishops are only one.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 6.

[Concill. Nicæen. can. 6.]

And according to the judgment of the Nicene council, we say, that the bishop of Rome hath no more jurisdiction over the church of God, than the rest of the patriarchs, either of Alexandria or of Antioch, have. [Vol. iv. p. 17.]

M. HARDING.

If it be a shame to helie the devil, according to the old proverb, what is it to belie the church of God represented in the Nicene council?

The sixth canon of the Nicene council declared to make against the defenders.

The sixth canon among all others of the Nicene council is that you ground your surmise upon. I know well. For that hath been wrested to your purpose by certain of your side. And the same rightly construed "maketh most against you. For it seemeth to acknowledge the bishop of Rome his supremacy and sovereignty of judgment over other patriarchs. These be the words of the canon rightly Englished: "Let the ancient custom continue in force which is in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapoli: so that the bishop of Alexandria have power over them all. *Quandoquidem etiam episcopo Romano hoc consuetum est*: 'Forasmuch as the bishop of Rome hath thus used.' Likewise in Antiochia also, and in other provinces, let the churches keep their prerogative." What can be gathered of the words of this canon, but that for ratifying the jurisdiction of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antiochia, the fathers of the Nicene council thought good to alter nothing: but to follow the ancient custom of old time used and allowed by the bishop of Rome? For it is as much to say as this: "Inasmuch as ^bthe bishop of Rome hath been wont from the beginning to grant to the bishop of Alexandria jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapoli; the ^cNicene council following his authority and rule, or at the least his usage, willeth and granteth, that the said bishop retain and keep his ancient right." For if the bishop of Alexandria had not received such jurisdiction by authority and grant of the bishop of Rome of old time, what reason should have moved those fathers, for confirmation thereof, to allege the custom of the bishop of Rome? and in that case, ^dwhereto pertained the addition of the cause, *quia episcopus Romanus hoc consuevit*: "because this was the bishop of Rome his custom?" If this had not been their meaning, they would never so have spoken. For what was his custom other ^ethan to allot these provinces to the bishop of Alexandria? if any other thing he alleged to have been his manner and custom, besides that the words of the canon bear it not, what had that been to the purpose, whatsoever it be, for cause and confirmation of the bishop of Alexandria his jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapoli? Allege you, defender, for old custom of the bishop of Rome what else you list, so that you make no violence to the canon, and thereupon make your argument, inferring of your allegation the conclusion, (*ergo*, the bishop of Alexandria ought to have jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapoli,) and you shall find it to be such an argument as any sot would be ashamed to make.

a Untruth. For the express words are plain to the contrary.

b Untruth. Vain and childish.

c This exposition is like a sick man's dream.

d O folly! The words are plain: *Quia episcopo Romano parilis mos est.*

e Untruth. For the bishop of Rome never had power to allot provinces: but himself had his province allotted him, as well as others.

Ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦ συνηθές ἐστι.

Against this if it shall like you to reply, we warn you before, that neither ye take advantage of a doubtful interpretation, as we know that canon to be found in divers books not so plainly trans-

lated, and therefore we require you to stand to the original, as it is in Greek: neither that ye defend your lie with the wrested exposition of Theodore Balsamon, who hath written Greek commentaries upon the canons of the councils sithence the schism of the Greeks, himself being a schismatic. For he being a Greek born, and pricked with the hatred of his nation against the Latin church, and specially the see of Rome, in the exposition of that sixth canon of the Nicene council swerveth both from learning, and also from reason.

A ne recipiatur.

Theodore Balsamon.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Indeed it is a shame to belie any creature, for that lying is shameful of itself. And therefore, M. Harding, ye might do much better to use it less. You have brought us here an exposition of the council of Nice, such as I think from that time until this time hath seldom been heard of. You say, the bishop of Rome's custom was to give jurisdiction to the patriarchs of Alexandria, of Antioch, and of Hierusalem: and that they had none authority of government, but only so much as was limited and allowed by him. And this, you say, was the only and undoubted meaning of that council. This phantasy is not here avouched by any ancient doctor or learned father. Therefore we must think, whatsoever it be, it is your own. And weighing the strangeness of the same, I must needs say of you as St. Hierom said sometime of one Rheticus in the like case: *Rheticus eloquens quidem est, sed ineptus interpres*: "Rheticus is an eloquent man indeed: and yet but a fond interpreter." For it is certain and known even unto children, that the bishop of Rome, before the council of Nice, had neither such custom of superiority, nor such dealing of jurisdictions. Pope Pius Secundus saith: *Ante Nicenam synodum unusquisque sibi vixit, et parvus respectus ad Romanam ecclesiam habebatur*: "Before the council of Nice every bishop lived to himself, and there was then small regard had of the church of Rome."

Hieronym. ad Marcel- lam. [ii. 622.]

Æneas Syl- vius, eplst. 288. [p. 802 d.]

As for our sottish arguments, such as by your judgment any sot would be ashamed to make, I may leave them well to you, M. Harding: not for that ye lack them greatly, but for that, as it appeareth by your books, ye know best how to use them.

Touching the sixth canon of this council, which you imagine is so dark and doubtful, I trust it shall be plainly and clearly opened by them that were never hitherto accounted sottish.

The words thereof are plain enough. The sense is this: The whole body of Christendom was divided into four patriarchships: whereof the first was Rome, the second Alexandria, the third Antioch, the fourth Hierusalem. And each of these was limited and bounded within itself: Alexandria to have the oversight over Egypt and Pentapolis: Antioch over Syria: Hierusalem over Jewry: Rome over Italy, and other churches of the west. And herein we have the exposition of Theodorus Balsamon, that lived five hundred years ago, and was patriarch of Antioch, and, as some of M. Harding's friends have thought, a man of great learning. Yet forasmuch as M. Harding here utterly refuseth him, not only as a schismatic, but also as a man void of learning and reason, let us therefore see some others.

[Balsamon
in Nican.
Syn. can. 6.]

Lipomanus
[Vit. Sanc-
torum] in
Præfatione.
Copus Dial.
166. Balsa-
monem vi-
rum certe
doctum.

Addition.

Addition. ¶ Here, saith M. Harding, "Search out, M. Jewel, why was Rome the first, and not rather the second, or the third? Thereby shall you perceive, how yourself unawares are taken in your own snare." This matter, M. Harding, is easily searched, and soon found. Indeed your forged Anacletus saith: "The apostolic church of Rome hath the preeminence over all churches, not from the apostles of Christ, but from Christ himself." And therefore full prettily he expoundeth the words of Christ: *Super hanc petram, id est, super ecclesiam Romanam, ædificabo ecclesiam meam*: "Upon this rock, that is to say, upon the church of Rome, will I build my church." But such vain forgeries make simple proof. The very cause why the church of Rome was placed in order and dignity before all others, was not the word of Christ, as you imagine, but the empire and honour of that city, which then, in respect of worldly glory, was the lady and head of the world." And therefore in the council of Chalcedon it is written thus: *Sedi veteris Romæ propter imperium civitatis illius patres consequenter privilegia reddiderunt*:

† Epist. 3. 4.
[1. 616. 618.]

† Anaclet.
epist. 1. [1.
606.]

Concil. Chal-
cedon, actio
16. [ul. actio
15. can. 28.]
p. 936.
[Mansi vii-
428 b. c.]

"The fathers orderly gave the privilege of chieftly to the see of old Rome, because that city had the empire." And immediately after it followeth further: *Et eadem intentione permoti æqua sanctissimæ sedi novæ Romæ privilegia tribuerunt, rationi congruum judicantes, ut civitas illa ornata imperio et senatu, æquis seniori regiæ Romæ privilegiis frueretur*: "The said holy fathers, moved with like consideration, gave the like privileges to the most holy see of Constantinople, which is called 'new Rome,' thinking it agreeable unto reason, that the same city of Constantinople, being honoured with empire and senate as Rome was, should enjoy the same privileges that Rome enjoyed."

Concil. Constantinopol.
cap. 5. [can.
3. iii. 559.]

The like hereof is written in the council of Constantinople⁸⁸. This, this, M. Harding, was the cause, and not the voice of Christ our Saviour, as you would tell us. For Christ never spake one word of the cities, either of Constantinople, or of Rome, or of the first see, or of the second. ➤

Nilus de Primatu Romani Pontificis.
[lib. 2. p. 29.]
καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἐτέ-
ρῳ τῆς ἀλ-
λοτρίας
ἐπιδεῖν. [leg.
τοῖς ἄλλο-
τροῖς ἐπι-
πηδᾶν.]

Nilus a Greek author hereof writeth thus: *Sed ut etiam liquidius appareat papam non imperare aliis omnibus episcopis, legatur sextus canon synodi Nicænæ: quo diserte præcipitur, [leg. ut videas decretum esse] ut aliis ecclesiis Alexandrinus, aliis Romanus, aliis Antiochenus præsit: ut non liceat alteri alterius provinciam invadere*: "That it may the more plainly appear that the pope hath no government over all other bishops, read the sixth canon of the council of Nice. There it is expressly commanded that the bishop of Alexandria shall have the rule over certain churches: and the bishop of Rome over certain: and the bishop of Antioch likewise over certain: and that it be not lawful for any one of them to invade another's jurisdiction." Farther he saith: *Quod si quis suis non contentus, aliena appetit, ille sane merito, et consuetudinis, et sanctorum canonum violator haberi debet*: "If any one" (of these patri-

⁸⁸ [Concil. Constantinop. can. 3. . . . τὸν μὲν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τίμης μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκο-

πον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην. In point of precedency, the bishop of Constantinople was to take rank next after that of Rome.]

archs), "not contented with his own, crave dominion over others," (as doth the pope,) "he ought of right to be called a breaker both of the custom, and also of the holy canons."

If M. Harding will yet say this exposition is sottish, let us see in what sort others have expounded the same.

Ruffinus opening the same canon, saith thus: *Statutum est in concilio Nicæno, ut apud Alexandriam, et [leg. vel] in urbe Roma vetusta consuetudo servetur: ut vel ille Ægypti, vel hic suburbicarum ecclesiarum solitudinem gerat*: "It was decreed in the council of Nice, that in Alexandria and in Rome the old custom should be kept: and the bishop of Alexandria should rule over Egypt: that the bishop of Rome" (not over all the world, but) "over the churches of his suburbs."^{Ruffinus Eccles. Hist. lib. i. [leg. x.] cap. 6. Suburbicarum ecclesiarum.}

Likewise it was afterward ordered in the council holden at Constantinople: *Definimus sedi Constantinopolitanæ paria jura et privilegia cum sede veteris Romæ*: "We decree that the see of Constantinople shall have rights and privileges 'equal'" (and one) "with the see of old Rome"⁸⁹.^{Concil. Constantinop. 2. cap. 36. [xi. 960.] τῶν ἰσῶν ἀπολαβεῖν [leg. ἀπολαύειν] πρεσβείων. Nicephor. lib. 12. cap. 13. [il. 244.]}

Therefore Nicephorus saith: (*Romano. et Constantinopolitano episcopo*) *ex æquo paria sunt et dignitatis præmia, et honorum jura*: "The titles of dignities and rights of honour given to the bishop of Rome, and to the bishop of Constantinople, are 'one' and 'equal'⁹⁰."

⁸⁹ [Concil. Constantin. 2. Quini-sext. cap. 36. Ἀνανεύμενοι τὰ παρὰ τῶν ρν'. ἁγίων πατέρων τῶν ἐν τῇ θεοφυλάκτῳ ταύτῃ καὶ βασιλίδι πόλει συνελθόντων (i. e. Concil. CP. can. 3. Mansi iii. 559.) καὶ τῶν χλ'. τῶν ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συνελθόντων νομοθετηθέντα, (i. e. Concil. Chalced. can. 28. Mansi vii. 428.) ὀρίζομεν, ὥστε τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον τῶν ἰσῶν ἀπολαύειν πρεσβείων τοῦ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης θρόνου, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνον μεγαλυνέσθαι πράγμασι, δεύτερον μετ' ἐκείνον ὑπάρχοντα. μεθ' ὃν ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων μεγαλοπόλεως ἀριθμείσθω θρόνος· εἴτα ὁ τῆς Ἀντιοχείων, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον ὁ τῆς Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν

πόλεως. It was partly on account of this canon that the church of Rome refused its sanction to the Concil. Quini-Sextum (in Trullo). See the Preface, Mansi tom. xi. p. 930. Pope Leo declined to add his subscription.]

⁹⁰ [Nicephorus. Here and infra p. 479. (fol. ed.) bishop Jewel can hardly be acquitted of having misapprehended the literal meaning of his author's words. . . . μετὰ δὲ τὸν Ῥώμης τὸν τῆς Κωνσταντίνου ἐπίσκοπον τὸ πρεσβείον ἔχειν, ἅτε δὴ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ὄντα ἐπίτροπον. οὐ μόνον γὰρ ἡ πόλις οὕτω προσηγορεύετο, γερούσια τε καὶ δῆμων τιμαῖς καὶ ἀρχαῖς ἐσεμνύνετο. ἀλλὰ καὶ σύμβολα καὶ

Athanas. ad
solitariam
vitam a-
gentes. [i.
364.]

Cod. de Sa-
cro-sanctis
Ecclesiis,
Omni Inno-
vatione.
[tom. iv. tit.
5. lex 6.]

Concil. Afri-
can. cap. 105.
[iv. 516 d.]

Nilus de
Primatu
Papæ, [lib.
2. p. 29.]

For this cause Athanasius saith: *Roma erat metropolis Romanæ ditionis*: “Rome was the mother church” (not of the whole world, but) “of the Roman jurisdiction.” In like sort the emperor Justinian saith: *Ecclesia urbis Constantinopolitanæ Romæ veteris prærogativa lætatur*: “The church of Constantinople enjoyeth the prerogative or privilege of the church of old Rome.” So likewise St. Augustine and other learned and godly bishops in the council of Africa understood the same canon. And therefore they called the pope’s presumption, craving universal jurisdiction over all the world: *Fumosum sæculi typhum*: “The smoky pride of the world.” To conclude, Nilus saith thus: *Nunc, cum aliæ regiones assignatæ sint Romano, aliæ Alexandrino, aliæ Constantinopolitano, non magis hi sub illo sunt, quam ille sub hisce*: “Seeing there be certain countries appointed out for the bishop of Rome, certain for the bishop of Alexandria, and certain for the bishop of Constantinople, they are now no more subject unto him, than he unto them.”

But all these perhaps were sots, and their sayings sottish: and no man is able rightly to understand these matters, but he that can say *consuetudo* is Latin for a “commission,” or *mos parilis* for “universal jurisdiction.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis. 7.*

And as for the bishop of Rome, who now calleth ^[Vol. iv. p. 17.] all matters before himself alone, except he do his duty as he ought to do, except he minister the sacraments, except he instruct the people, except he warn them and teach them, we say that he ought not of right once to be called a bishop, or so much as an elder. For a bishop, as saith Augustine, is a name of labour, and not of honour: that the man that seek-

[Augustin.
de Civ. Dei,
xix. 19. tom.
vii. 563.]

ἔθιμα τῶν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Ῥωμαίων ἡŷχει.
τά τε γέρα καὶ τὰ ἐκ τιμῆς δίκαια
ἐπίσης ἑκάτερα, ἴσα ἦν. Bishop
Jewel has applied to the bishops,
what in this sentence Nicephorus

appears to have meant of the ci-
ties, of Rome and Constantinople.
From Nicephorus’ words however
an inference may be drawn for the
equality of the bishops.]

eth to have preeminence, and not to profit, may understand himself to be no bishop⁹¹.

M. HARDING.

An evil bishop loseth not the name of a bishop, though he lose the merit of a bishop.

Vide August. lib. 2. contra Epistol. Parmen. cap. 13. tom. 7. [tom. ix. 44.]

1 Tim. ii.

Neither the bishop of Rome, nor any other bishop is worthy of the name of a bishop, except he doth the duty of a bishop. All this we grant. But that he ought not of right to be so called of those whom he hath charge over in case of omitting his duty, thereto we say, that, although in respect of his demeanour he be not worthy to be called a bishop, yet in respect of the vocation, degree, and preeminence, though he leave his duty undone, for which he incurreth danger of damnation, that title pertaineth unto him of good right, and so continually he is, and ought to be acknowledged for a bishop, though an evil and an unworthy bishop : likewise a priest⁹². And whereas St. Augustine saith : "That a bishop is a name of labour, and not of honour," he is to be understood so as the scripture is : which in some places speaking of two things that are both indeed to be affirmed, the one being of more importance than the other, denieth the one in comparison of the other, &c.

Yet it seemeth to be a secret preparation towards a purpose against such time as the princes' government shall mislike their phantasies. For where they learned this opinion concerning bishops, there learned they also the like concerning civil magistrates. I mean Wickliffe : among whose heretical articles, condemned by the church in the council of Constance, this is reckoned for the fifteenth : *Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est prælatus, nullus est episcopus, dum est in peccato mortali*. That is to say : "None is a temporal lord, none is a prelate, none is a bishop, so long as he is in deadly sin....."⁹³.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This matter shall need no great contention. The like words have been uttered by sundry other holy fathers.

St. Chrysostom saith : *Multi sacerdotes, et pauci sacerdotes : multi nomine, pauci opere* : "Many priests there be, and few

Chrysost. in Opere Imperfecto, hom. 43. [vi. app. 183.]

⁹¹ [Augustin. de Civit. Dei. "Propter quod ait apostolus, Qui episcopatum desiderat, bonum opus desiderat. Exponere voluit quid sit episcopatus ; quia nomen est operis, non honoris. Græcum est enim, atque inde ductum vocabulum, quod ille qui præficitur eis quibus præficatur superintendit, curam eorum scilicet

"gerens : . . . ut intelligat non se esse episcopum, qui præesse dixerit, non prodesse."]

⁹² [Harding adds, "Which this youthful lady-interpreter, following the instinct of their new sprite, termeth 'an elder.'"]

⁹³ [Some few unimportant words are omitted.]

priests there be: many in name, and few in labour.” Again: *Quomodo potest esse magister qui discipulum non habet?.....acquire discipulum, et esto magister*: “How can he be a master that hath no scholar? get thee a scholar, and then be a master.”

Chrysost. in
eadem hom.
[ibid. 185.]

Ambros. de
Dignita. Sa-
cerdotali,
cap. 4. [ii.
app. 360.]

Gregor. lib.
4. epist. 32.
[ii. 747.]

St. Ambrose saith: *Nisi bonum opus amplectaris, episcopus esse non potes*: “Unless thou embrace the good labour, a bishop thou canst not be⁹⁴.” St. Gregory saith: *Sacerdotes nominamur, et non sumus*: “Priests we are called, but priests we are not.”

As for Wickliffe, his scholar John Huss expoundeth his meaning, and that with M. Harding’s own construction. For these be his words even as they are alleged by his enemies: *Papa, vel prælatus malus et præscitus, est æquivoce pastor, et vere fur et latro*: “The pope, or any other wicked prelate, in double or doubtful speech is a pastor: but in very deed he is a thief and a murderer.” So Chrysostom saith: *Qui ab hominibus ordinatus est, quantum ad Deum (attinet) non est sacerdos, aut diaconus*: “He that is appointed by men” (and not by God), “before God is neither priest nor deacon.”

In Concl.
Constantien.
sess. 15.
[xxvii. 755.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom. 3
[leg. hom. 53.
vi. app. 221.]
in Opere
Imperfecto.

If Wickliffe, upon just zeal of the house of God, for that he then saw the bishops either knew nothing, or did nothing, or cared for nothing, either spake or meant more than truth may bear, we defend it not. Notwithstanding, touching that is objected of deadly sin, it seemeth he followed therein the council of Valentia in France. The words be these: *Quicumque sub ordinatione, vel diaconatus, vel presbyterii, vel episcopatus mortali crimine dixerint se esse pollutos, a supradictis ordinationibus submoveantur*: “Whosoever after the order, either of deaconship, or priesthood, or of bishopric, shall say they have been defiled with mortal sin, let them be removed from the foresaid orders.” If M. Harding shall devise any other exposition hereof, I will not greatly strive with him for it. So St. Augustine saith, as

Concl. Va-
lent. sub
Damas. cap.
4. [lii. 493.]

⁹⁴ [This work is pronounced spurious by the Bened. ed. and by Oudin, Script. de Eccl. tom. i. 670. the real author being

Gerbertus, or Sylvester II. at the end of the tenth century. Cave places it amongst the genuine works of St. Ambrose.]

he is alleged by Gratian: "He that neither hath wiped off^{2. Quæst. 7.} his own sins, nor corrected the sins of his children, ought ^{Qui nec re-} rather to be called a shameless dog, than a bishop^{giminis.} 95."

Yet notwithstanding, to remove all strife, whatsoever the bishop of Rome be, or whatsoever he do, let him hardly⁹⁶ be called a bishop, because, as M. Harding saith, he standeth in room of a bishop: or, as Wickliffe saith, let him so be called *æquivoce*, that is to say, by a word of double meaning: as unsavoury salt is called salt: or, as the prophets of Baal are called prophets: or, as a painted man is called a man: and, as St. Gregory saith: "Let him in words be called a priest, although in deed he be no priest." Let him be called a teacher, although he teach not. Let him be called a feeder, although he feed not. St. Cyprian saith of St. Paul: *Ipsum quamvis inane nomen, et umbram* ^{Cyprian. lib. 1. epist. 3.} *quandam sacerdotis cogitans, expavit*: "St. Paul was afraid, ^[ad Cornel. p. 81.] considering only the empty name and shadow of a bishop."

And in the late council of Trident the matter is concluded thus: *Qui dicit eos qui non exercent ministerium verbi et sacramentorum non esse sacerdotes, anathema sit*: "Who- ^{Concil. Tri-} soever saith, that they that minister neither the word of ^{dent. de Sa-} God nor the sacraments be no priests, accursed be he⁹⁷." ^{cramento} But Athanasius saith: *Quid opus est hominibus titulo episco-* ^{Ordinis.} *pis?* "What need have we of these men, that bear only the ^[Harduin. x. 137.] name of bishops⁹⁸?" Therefore St. Hierom saith: *Auferet* ^{Athanas. ad} ^{solitariam} ^{vitam a-} ^{gentes. [tom. i. 376.]} ^{Hieron. in} ^{Sophoniam,} ^{cap. 1. [iii. 1647.]}

⁹⁵ [This sentence, though cited by Gratian as from St. Augustine, is not found amongst that father's extant works. The correctors of the last ed. of Gratian refer to dist. 83. c. 2. for a similar passage there attributed to St. Gregory.]

⁹⁶ [Hardly: here and elsewhere, this word seems to be used in the sense of "with whatever difficulty."]

⁹⁷ [This is a misrepresentation (though an unintentional one) of the decree of the council of Trent, de Ordine, can. 1.: "Si quis dixerit . . . eos qui non prædicant prorsus non esse sacerdotes, anathema sit." The origin of the error will be found in Chemnitius, (Exam. Concil. Tridentin. p. 574.)

whose exact words, purporting to be those of the Decree, bishop Jewel has copied.]

⁹⁸ [The quotation from Athanasius seems to the Editor hardly relevant. Constantius had fortified his decree of persecution against the orthodox, by the authority of certain bishops whom he had gained over. Upon which Athanasius remarks, *εἰ γὰρ ἐπισκόπων ἐστὶ κρίσις, τί κοινὸν ἔχει πρὸς ταύτην βασιλεὺς; εἰ δὲ βασιλέως ἐστὶν ἀπειλή, τίς ἐν ταύτῃ ἀρχαίᾳ τῶν λεγομένων ἐπισκόπων;* "It is either a civil matter, or an ecclesiastical one: if civil, what have the bishops to do with it? if ecclesiastical, what the emperor?" The stress does not seem to lie

Dominus nomina vanæ gloriæ, et admirationis falsæ, quæ versantur in ecclesia.....Sed et nomina sacerdotum cum sacerdotibus auferet, qui frustra sibi applaudunt in episcopali, et in presbyterii dignitate, et non in opere: "The Lord shall take away the names of vain glory and of feigned wondering, which are in the church. Yea he shall take away both the names of those priests, and the priests withal, which vaunt themselves in the dignity of bishopric and priesthood, but not in the labour."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis.* 1.

And that neither the pope nor any other worldly creature can no more be head of the whole church, or a bishop over all, than he can be the bridegroom, the light, the salvation, and life of the church. For these privileges and names belong only to Christ, and be properly and only fit for him alone. [Vol. iv. p. 17.]

And that no bishop of Rome did ever suffer himself to be called by such a proud name and title, before Phocas the emperor's time, (who, as we know, by killing his own sovereign Mauritius the emperor⁹⁷, did by a traitorous villainy aspire to the empire,) which was about the sixth hundred and thirteenth year after Christ was born.

M. HARDING.

The name of universal bishop, which this interpreter meaneth, being taken in a right sense, is no proud name in respect of him a to whom it belongeth. Whether any bishop of Rome ever suffered himself to be called by that name or no, as you deny it and prove it not, so it forceth not whether any did so or no. If they refused it of humility, that proveth it not to be unlawful⁹⁸..... Universal bishop.

a Untruth.
For it be-
longed not
unto the
pope.

upon the word *λεγομένων* (though meant doubtless as a depreciating term) so much as upon *ἐπισκόπων*. Whereas bishop Jewel turns the sentence into a general reflection upon those who hold the office, without preforming the functions, of a bishop.]

⁹⁷ [Phocas, see an account of

this murder, supra vol. ii. 177.]

⁹⁸ [Harding adds: "The fact of Phocas, no man defending it, why you should so much aggravate, there is no cause. As no bishop of Rome took upon him the name of 'universal bishop' before Phocas, so neither after him did the popes challenge and use the same."]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

If the name of universal bishop be a proud name in others, why may it not also be a proud name in the bishop of Rome? hath the bishop there such a special privilege for pride above all others? may pride be humility, and humility pride, only in respect of divers persons? You say, This title of right belonged to the bishop of Rome, and therefore in him it was no pride. This, M. Harding, is a foul untruth, as it shall appear by the next division. For these be the words of the council of Carthage, or at least, by your own confession, of Gratian, alleging the council of Carthage: *Universalis autem (episcopus) nec ipse Romanus pontifex appelletur*: “The bishop of Rome himself may not be called the universal bishop.” Dist. 99.
Primæ Sedis.

That the old learned and godly bishops of Rome refused this name as proud and arrogant, it is so plain by St. Gregory, that I marvel any learned man would call it in question⁹⁹. His words thereof be these: *Nullus decessorum meorum hoc tam profano vocabulo uti consensit*:—*nullus Romanorum pontificum hoc singularitatis nomen assumpsit* [leg. *nomine uti consensit*]:—*nos hunc honorem nolumus oblatum suscipere*: “None of my predecessors, bishops of Rome, ever consented to use this ungodly name: no bishop of Rome ever took upon him this name of singularity: we, the bishop of Rome, will not receive this honour being offered unto us.” Gregor. lib.
4. epist. 32.
[ii. 771.] et
36. [ii. 749.]

If the bishops of Rome in old times refused this name, not for want of right, but only, as M. Harding saith, of humility, wherefore then did their successors that followed afterward so ambitiously labour to get the same? Platina saith: *Bonifacius Tertius obtinuit a Phoca, magna tamen contentione*: “Pope Bonifacius the Third obtained of the emperor Phocas” (that Rome should be called the head of all churches), “but with ‘great contention, and much ado.’” Wherefore then doth St. Augustine and the whole council of Africa condemn the attempt of this usurped Platina in
Bonifac. III.

⁹⁹ [See a great number of passages from St. Gregory's epistles collected in the fourth Article of the Replie. Supra vol. ii. pp. 142 —146.]

jurisdiction, and call it, *FUMOSUM SÆCULI TYPHUM*? "THE SMOKY PRIDE OF THE WORLD?" and that even in the bishops of Rome?

If the bishop of Rome be so full of humility as we are here borne in hand, why advanceth he himself so high above all general councils? why saith he, that no creature may judge his doings? why claimeth he the sword and sceptre of all the world? why saith he, that Christ's consistory and his consistory are all one, and that he can do all that God can do? why doth he say, that the emperor is but the proctor or bailiff of the church of Rome? *procurator sive defensor Romanæ ecclesiæ*? why doth he suffer kings and emperors to hold his stirrup, to lead his palfrey, and to kiss his foot? Verily this kind of humility in other places might go for pride. Hesychius¹ saith: *Ubi superbia regnat et hypocrisis, humilitas locum non habet*: "Where pride and hypocrisy bear the sway, there humility can have no place." Likewise Chrysostom saith: *Quicumque desideraverit primatum in terra, inveniet in cælo confusio-nem: nec inter servos Christi computabitur, qui de primatu tractaverit*: "Whosoever desireth primacy in earth, in heaven he shall find confusion: neither shall he be accounted among the servants of Christ, that will once entreat of primacy."

Dist. 98. [leg.
dist. 96.] Si
imperat. in
Gloss.

Hesych.
Sent. lib. 4.
dist. 17.
Cum ergo.

Dist. 40.
Mult.

M. Harding,
185 a.

Addition. ☞ But hereto M. Harding answereth: "Why *Addition.*
did you not quote the place, M. Jewel? Chrysostom hath no such saying. That which goeth before in Gratian is taken out of *Opus Imperfectum*, hom. 43², which is well known not to be Chrysostom's. But this saying which here you allege out of Gratian, is neither there, nor in Chrysostom. It is a forgery: and that you know well enough. Yet you are not ashamed to use it, to deceive the ignorant reader. Leave, leave, M. Jewel, to abuse the simplicity of the unlearned with such forged pieces and patches." *The answer.*
M. Harding, how shall poor M. Jewel be able to answer

M. Harding,
185 b.

¹ [Hesychius, as quoted by Peter Lombard, where a marginal note refers to the Commentary upon Leviticus, without specifying the exact place.]

² [The passage is, word for

word, in Gratian; and in the margin there is a reference to Chrysost. hom. 43. (a mistake for 35, which misled Harding,) ad cap. 23. Matth.]

this kind of eloquence? It becometh you so well, that it were great pity ye should speak better. Though this were a forgery indeed, as you have so sadly told us, yet you know, it were your own Gratian's forgery: it were not mine. You say: "The book entituled *Opus Imperfectum* was never written by Chrysostom." I can easily yield hereto, and never strive for it. And yet your Gratian allegeth the same book by the name of Chrysostom, as you know. Neither did I allege these words as out of Chrysostom, but as out of the book of Gratian's decrees, allowed to the world by pope Eugenius III. and commonly called *Fundamentum Juris Canonici*. Whoso is able truly to bring forth his author, ought not of right to be charged with forgery. You do wrong therefore, M. Harding, with such outcries to raise the country upon him that hath not offended.

But, I pray you, be these words neither in *Opere Imperfecto*, as you say, nor in any other book of Chrysostom? and do I know it, as you tell me? or will you say, yourself do know it? or, if you so say, may we believe it? Surely if ye had sought these words better, ye might have found them. But ye sought them where they were not, and sought in vain. In the thirty-fifth homily of that same book it is written thus: *Quicumque desideraverit primum in terra, inveniet in cælo confusionem: ut jam inter servos Christi non sit de primatu certamen.* These be the self-same words, that you say cannot be found, neither in *Opere Imperfecto*, nor in any other book of Chrysostom. Here is neither piecing nor patching, M. Harding. It is plain-dealing: it is no forgery. If these words thus placed do not like you, as it appeareth they do not, then change them hardly, and take the contrary, and rather say thus: "Whosoever desireth primacy in earth shall find no confusion in heaven." This perhaps may seem better to serve your turn. Here might I triumph, and say to you as you say to me: "Yet are you not ashamed," &c. "Leave, leave, M. Harding," &c. ☞

To conclude, a learned man, one of M. Harding's own side, hereupon hath noted thus: *Bonifacius.....obtinuit a Phoca, ut ecclesia Romana esset caput omnium ecclesiarum.*

Dist. 40.
Multi.

Hom. 35. in
Opere Im-
perfect. [vi.
append. 153.
col. i. C.]

Johan. de
Parisiis de
Potestate
Reg. et Pa-
pali, cap. 13.
[leg. cap. 15.]

.....*Ex quo posset modo consimili sumi argumentum, quod ad imperatorem pertineat, primatum ecclesiæ transferre, et de ecclesiis ordinare*: “Pope Bonifacius the Third obtained of the emperor Phocas, that the church of Rome should be the head of all churches. Whereof we may in like case gather an argument, that it belongeth to the emperor, to translate the primacy of the church, and to take order for the churches.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis. 2.*

[Concil. Carthag. 3. c. 26, Muni iii. 884.]

Also the council of Carthage did circumspectly³ [Vol. iv. p. 18.] provide, that no bishop should be called either the “highest bishop” or “chief priest.”

M. HARDING.

M. Harding is a merry man.

Here by your leave, sir defender, you play false, and are taken as it were with false dice, and therefore ye ought justly to lose all that ye have unjustly won. By your false play and false dice, I mean your shameful falsifying of this council by you alleged. And for this and other your falsehood, it is right you lose the credit which unjustly (because by false teaching) you have won among the unlearned. That your false play might not soon be espied, you do as like to M. Jewel as though you were his father's son. For that false sleight he useth more, than any that ever I read. For whereas we have seven councils of Carthage, neither shew you, which of them it is that you allege, nor give any notice of the number, where the canon may be found⁴. But contrariwise as the lapwing with her busy cry leadeth a man from her nest, so you lead us from the place where it is, by putting in the margin of your book the number 47, that, not finding it by your note, we should give over further looking for it. “Who doth evil hateth light,” saith Christ. So here falsifying⁵ and forging a canon of a council, you would fain walk in clouds, that your lying might not be deprehended⁵, &c. So had it been done more circumspectly for furtherance of your falsehood, if the matter should never come to trial of learning.

Falsifying of a council.

John iii.

a Untruth. For this canon will soon be found.

³ [Lat. Apol. *diserte*.]

⁴ [Harding probably forgot that bishop Jewel had quoted the exact words of this canon in the Replie. Supra vol. ii. p. 161.]

⁵ [Harding adds: “Your lady-interpreter hath done prettily also

for her part in translating your Latin word *diserte* into this English word ‘circumspectly.’ Whereby she thought your lie might the better be soothed and auctorized. Which altogether as it is done untruly, so had it,” &c.]

Now, whosoever examineth the place truly must needs cry out, "Shame on you, defender, who are the author." The words, if you had listed to have alleged them without falsehead, be these, which we find in the twenty-sixth canon of the third council of Carthage, which council was authorized by the sixth general council holden at Constantinople in Trullo: *Ut primæ sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi, sed tantum, primæ sedis episcopus*. And thus they are to be Englished: "It hath liked us" (say the fathers of that council) "that a bishop of a first see be not called 'prince of priests,' or 'highest priest,' or any such other thing, but only 'a bishop of a first see.'" Now cometh me this jolly defender, and saith, "the council of Carthage hath express words" (for so much his Latin soundeth) "that no bishop should be called either the 'highest bishop,' or 'chief priest.'" By which canon thus by him untruly uttered, he thought to deprive the pope of this ^bancient title that all the world hath ever attributed unto him, so as he be called no more *summus pontifex*.

^b Untruth, as shall appear.

For the right understanding of this canon two things are to be considered: how far the authority of this council ought to be extended, and what is meant by a "first see." ^cThe decrees of this council pertained but to the province of Africa. For provincial councils bind only the provinces in which, and for order of which, they be kept. Only the general councils are to be received of all.....

^c Untruth. For this council namely restraineth the bishop of Rome.

Prima sedes, what it meaneth.

By these two words *prima sedes* those fathers understood any city in which a patriarch or primate, who are of one office, though of divers names, hath his see. I call it a "first see," or rather (if it might be permitted) a "primate see." ^dIn great cities where the highest courts for justice were kept, and where the chief pagan priests of the Latins, named *Primi Flamines*, were resident before the coming of Christ, there, after Christ's coming, were patriarchs or primates placed, by whom the weighty matters of bishops should be decided. ^eWhich order was taken first by commandment of St. Peter, as Clement writeth: by the apostles and Clement, as Anacletus witnesseth: by the apostles and their successors afterward, as Lucius the pope saith⁶.....

^d Untruth, grounded up on a fable.

^e Untruth, grounded as the former.

Dist. 99. C. Provincie.

Now the council of Carthage, by this defender alleged, and likewise the African council, ordained and willed that a bishop of any of the primate sees of Africa should not be called *princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos*, "prince or chief of the priests, or highest priest," by which word a bishop is there signified, but

⁶ [Harding goes on to specify what the patriarchates were—and he then adds: "In the second canon of this third council of Carthage, the fathers making a decree, that every year a council be kept for all Africa, appoint, that all the

provinces which have first or primate sees, send from their synods to the council each one or two bishops. But from Tripoli" (say they) "for the small number of bishops there, let but one bishop come."]

f Most manifest and most vain untruth.

g A great untruth.

only a bishop of the primate see whereof he was primate. By which decree they willed ^fonly their primates of Africa to keep themselves within their limits, and not presumptuously to take upon them more glorious titles and further jurisdiction than to them pertained, lest surely they might seem to prejudicate the pope's supremacy. Thus it is evident, the authority of that Carthage council being restrained to Africa only, that by this canon the pope's primacy and title is no whit diminished or disproved. And so for all this defender, he remaineth as he hath ever, highest bishop.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

What, M. Harding, so much falsehead upon us at one time? falsifying of councils: shameful falsifying: false teaching: false sleight: false dice: false play: and all false? Christ saith of himself: "I am the truth." God give you grace to credit him. For the error of quotation in the margin, wherein you spend so many words, it may please you to know, that I neither was the printer, nor could be present at the printing. For the rest, if there can be any one point of falsehead found in me touching the allegation of this council of Carthage, I will not refuse to stand charged with the whole. But if every of these horrible falseheads be found an evident and plain truth, then it may please you to take home all these pretty titles to yourself again, as in every of these words so often doubled, and so heaped together, having yourself committed a several falsehead.

And herein for trial of your courteous dealing, I am content yourself shall sit and be the judge. For, notwithstanding it be thought of many that ye dissemble deeply, and will not bestow your voice to say the truth, yet I doubt not but in this matter, if ye have eyes, ye may easily look up and see the truth.

You say: "Sir defender hath falsely alleged the council of Carthage." And why so? For that he saith, The council decreed by express words, that the bishop of Rome should not be called the universal bishop. This, you say, is forged and falsified, and is no part of that council. For indifferent trial both of the truth and of the falsehead herein, I beseech you behold the very words of the council,

even as they are alleged by your own doctor Gratian. These they are: *Primæ sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, vel summus sacerdos, vel aliquid hujusmodi: sed tantum primæ sedis episcopus.* *UNIVERSALIS AUTEM NEC ETIAM ROMANUS PONTIFEX APPELLETUR*: "Let not the bishop of any of the first sees be called the prince of priests, or the highest priest, or by any other like name: but only the bishop of the first see. BUT LET NOT THE BISHOP OF ROME HIMSELF BE CALLED THE UNIVERSAL BISHOP." And in the Gloss thereupon it is noted thus: *In hac distinctione dicitur, quod PAPA NON DEBET DICI UNIVERSALIS*: "In this distinction it is said, that THE POPE OUGHT NOT TO BE CALLED THE UNIVERSAL BISHOP."

Dist. 99.
Primæ.
[Concil. Carthag. iii. c. 26. Mansi iii. 884.]

Addition.

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding crieth out bitterly: M. Harding, 190 b.
"M. Jewel is a shameless man: three main lies: O impudent glosser! Are ye not ashamed," &c. "These be not the words of the council of Carthage. They are to be referred to the third part of the distinction that followeth afterward⁷." Your speech is terrible, M. Harding, and argueth some inordinate passion in your stomach. Refer these words whither you will. If they be not written in the council of Carthage, yet at the least they are the words of Gratian alleging the words of the council of Carthage. Be they his words, or be they the council's, I will not strive. Well you know, they are not mine. Thus he saith, by your own confession: *Universalis autem nec etiam Romanus pontifex appelletur*: "Let not the bishop of Rome himself be called the 'universal bishop.'" And this you confess is the meaning of pope Pelagius, that followeth immediately in the same distinction. Now, M. Harding, what great prejudice is this, as touching the right of our cause, if we lose the authority of the council of

M. Harding, 191 a.

⁷ [In the old edd. of Gratian the sentence was referred to the third pt. of the Dist., as Harding asserts. In Richter's ed. it is entitled the second part of the chapter in which the words "primæ sedis episcopus," &c. occur; but it is printed in a different type; nor is it, in fact, a part of the 26th can. of

Concil. Carth. iii. The Magdeburg Centuriators (tom. ii. 554.) unjustly accuse Crabbe of suppressing this sentence. Bishop Jewel himself (supra vol. ii. 286.) repeats the accusation. But all the editions of the Councils omit the clause.]

Carthage, and get the authority of the pope himself, who in your judgment, and as you have written and published to the world, is above the authority of all councils? Whatsoever the council of Carthage say, the pope himself saith, as it is noted in the rubric: *Nec etiam Romanus pontifex universalis est appellandus.*

M. Harding's
Confutation,
p. 284 a. [*leg.*
Detection,
191.]

Now touching the Gloss, ye run upon me with hue and cry: "O impudent glosser," you say, "are you not ashamed to shew your peevish falsehood? why left you out the beginning of the sentence?" Truly, M. Harding, I knew not your diet: otherwise I could as good cheap have served you with all together. I left out nothing that was necessary. But, forasmuch as ye want something, I know not what, ye shall have free liberty to make it up at your pleasure. The whole words be these: *Hæc est tertia pars distinctionis, in qua dicitur, quod papa non debet vocari universalis*: "This is the third part of this distinction, wherein it is said, that the pope ought not to be called the 'universal bishop.'"

Now tell us, good master Harding, what peevish falsehood, or what impudent glossing is this? or, saving some part of your folly, whereat ought any man to be ashamed? ➡

Augustin.
contra Cresc.
lib. 3. cap.
38. [*leg.* 78.
ix. 480.]

Touching that you so pleasantly cheer yourself with these words: "You do as like to M. Jewel, as if you were his father's son." I must answer you, as St. Augustine sometime did the heretic Cresconius: *Serva potius puerilia pueris*: "Keep such childish toys to play with your children." God make us both like unto our Father that is in heaven.

Artic. 4.
[ante, vol. ii.
293.]

Gregor. lib.
7. epist. 30.
[ii. 919.]

Where you say, of yourself only, without farther witness, that this title is the pope's ancient right, ever given to him by all the world, I doubt not, but the untruth hereof by my former Reply, touching the same, may soon appear. Certainly, when the same title was offered to St. Gregory, he refused it utterly, as none of his.

Indeed, this council of Carthage notwithstanding, the title of highest bishops was sometime given, not only to the bishop of Rome, and other patriarchs, but also unto all

other bishops. M. Harding's own Amphilochius calleth St. Basil: *Principem sacerdotum*: "The prince or chief of bishops." Ruffinus calleth Athanasius: *Pontificem maximum*: "The highest bishop." Nazianzenus calleth the same Athanasius: *Archisacerdotem sacerdotum*: "The chief bishop of bishops."⁸ Lactantius calleth every bishop: *Summum sacerdotium*. Likewise St. Hierom saith: *Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet*: "The safety of the church standeth in the dignity of the highest priest." By which "highest priest," M. Harding himself saith, is meant every several bishop within his own diocess. St. Augustine saith: *Quid est episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est, summus sacerdos?* "What is a bishop, but the first or chief priest, that is to say, the highest priest?"⁹ Therefore we may safely spare the pope this title of "highest bishop," not as peculiar to him alone, as M. Harding imagineth, but as common and general to all bishops.

All that ye have here alleged of the jurisdiction of the *flamines* is a mere phantasy, grounded only upon an unsavoury fable of Anacletus and Clemens. Neither are you able to find either these names, *archiflamines* or *protoflamines*, which here are imagined, in any ancient allowed writer, or any such universal jurisdiction to them belonging¹⁰.

The first, or principal, or mother sees were limited, not by the *flamines*, but by the prince. So it is written in the council of Chalcedon: *Quascunque civitates per literas*

M. Harding's Amphiloch. Ruffinus, lib. 2. cap. 23. [leg. lib. xi. cap. 28.] Nazian. ad Heronem. [l. 462.] Lactan. lib. 4. cap. 30. Hieron. contra Luciferianos. [iv. pt. 2. 295.] M. Harding in his answer to the Apology, fol. 204 b. In Quæst. ex utroque Testam. mixt. qu. 101. [iii. app. 93.]

⁸ [Nazianz. in laudem Heronis. . . . καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῶν ἱερέων Ἀθανασίου. . . .]

⁹ [These Quæst. ex utroque Test. are not genuine.]

¹⁰ [See Fuller's Church History of Britain, cent. 2. sect. 9. "Jeffery Monmouth tells us that at this time there were in England twenty-eight cities, each of them having a flamen or pagan priest; and three of them, namely London, York, and Caerlion in Wales, had arch-flamens to which the rest were subjected: and Lucius placed bishops in the room of the fla-

mens, and archbishops metropolitans in the places of arch-flamens. All which, saith he, solemnly received their confirmation from the pope. But herein our author seems not well acquainted with the propriety of this word flamen, &c. Besides, the British MS., which Monmouth is conceived to have translated, makes no mention of those flamens, &c. So that, in plain English, his *flamens* and *arch-flamens* seem *flamms* and *arch-flamms*, even notorious falsehoods."]

Council. Chalcedon. cap. 12. [viii. 364.]

regias metropolitico nomine honorarunt: “What cities soever by the ‘prince’s charter,’ they honoured with the name of the ‘mother see.’”

Chrysost. ad
Pop. Antio-
chen. hom.
17. [ii. 178.]

And therefore the emperor Theodosius, upon displeasure conceived, took that name of honour from the city of Antioch, minding it should be so called no more. And for that cause was the city of Rome chosen amongst others to be a primate or a principal mother see, not for that either Christ or Peter had so appointed, as M. Harding telleth us, but for that it was the most noble city, and of greatest renown in all the world. The words be plain: *Sedi veteris Romæ patres merito dederunt primatum, quod illa civitas aliis imperaret*: “The fathers worthily gave the chieftly to the see of the old Rome, BECAUSE THAT CITY HAD THE PRINCEHOOD OVER OTHERS¹⁰.”

Concil. Chal-
cedon. cap.
28. [vii. 369,
370.]

Now concerning this decree of the council of Carthage, it touched as well the bishop of Rome, as other primates. And therefore pope Adrian¹¹ afterward alleging and corrupting the same, addeth thereto this special proviso for himself: *Nullus archiepiscoporum, nisi qui primas sedes tenent, appelletur primas, aut princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi, &c. Salva semper in omnibus autoritate beati Petri apostoli*: “Let no archbishop, saving such as have the principal or first sees, be called either the primate, or the prince of priests, or the highest priest, or by any other like name, &c. Saving always, and in all things, the authority of blessed St. Peter the apostle.”

Adrian. Papa.
In Capitulis
ex Synodis,
et Canonib.
Diver. Col-
lect. [Crabb,
Concil. ed.
Col. A.D.
1561.] tom. 2.
p. 611.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. Divis. 3.

And therefore, sithence the bishop of Rome will [Vol. iv. p. 18.] nowadays so be called, and challengeth unto himself an authority that is none of his: besides that he doth plainly contrary to the ancient councils, and

¹⁰ [Concil. Chalced. c. 28. . . .
καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας
‘Ρώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεῦν τὴν πόλιν
ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδε-
δῶκασιν τὰ πρεσβεία. . . .]

¹¹ [According to Cave this was
Adrian I. and the collection of
eighty-four canons was composed
A.D. 783.]

contrary to the old fathers : we believe, that he doth give to himself, as it is written by his own companion Gregory, a presumptuous, a profane, a sacrilegious, and an antichristian name : that he is also the king of pride, that he is Lucifer, which preferreth himself before his brethren : that he hath forsaken the faith, and is the forerunner of Antichrist.

All these be the words of Gregory.

M. HARDING.

Here is much ado about nought, and a number of bitter words picked out of St. Gregory's epistles, pretended to be written against the bishop of Rome, to no purpose. For if we say, ^aas we may say truly, that he challengeth to himself no such name, then what hath this defender to say ? Let him shew us how many bishops of that see ever took the name of the "universal bishop" upon them, specially as Gregory understandeth it to signify. If he can shew none, why blotteth he so much paper with so impudent lies ?.....

^a Untruth. For Platina saith : *Bonifacius III. obtinuit a Phoca, magna tamen contentione.*

^b Indeed the six hundred and thirty fathers of the general council of Chalcedon¹² gave to pope Leo that name, as Gregory in three sundry epistles writeth, and certain other in their writings have attributed to the pope the same. But that either Leo, or any other his successor affected so to be called, Gregory denieth. ^dAnd that any since Gregory's time to our days, ever called or wrote himself "universal bishop," we deny.....

^b There appeareth no such matter in all that council.

Whereas Pelagius and Gregory, writing against the presumption of John the bishop of Constantinople for taking upon him this name, are much alleged by the enemies of unity against the authority of Peter's successor over the whole church : we say, that they, following the steps of their predecessors, refused the name of "universal bishop" in such sense as Pelagius and specially Gregory oftentimes declareth, that where one is called "universal bishop," he seemeth to be called ^ebishop alone, so as bishopric should be taken away from all others. But they refused not so to be called after this meaning, as though by that refusal the authority of the bishop of Rome should be restrained, and not extend over the whole church. They deny, that any man might so be universal bishop, as he should be also the peculiar ruler and governor of every particular church. For so all other bishops had been in vain : and that is contrary to Christ's institution, who ordained all the apostles to be bishops..... To say all in few, they refused the name that might odiously be

^c Untruth, as appeareth by the former authority of Platina.

^d Untruth, as further appeareth by the answer.

^e Untruth and most vain phantasy. For no bishop of Constantinople ever dreamed of such authority.

¹² [See bishop Jewel's observations upon this point, supra vol. ii. 283.]

f Untruth,
for Christ
never erected
any such
primacy.

g The like
whole charge
was given to
Paul, John,
and Mat-
thew, as
shall appear.

taken, they refused not the primacy ^f which Christ to them had committed. Therefore Gregory writing to Morice the emperor, alleging the words that make for Peter's authority over the whole flock of Christ, saith of Peter, " ^g The charge of the whole church and principality is committed to him, and yet is he not called 'universal apostle.' " Where it is plain, that Gregory doth both affirm the charge of the whole, and denieth the name of "universal"¹³. ".....Let these defenders grant the thing, and we strive not for the name.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here it pleaseth M. Harding of his courtesy to say, We have blotted our paper with so many and so many impudent lies. His whole discourse standeth only in the construction of this word "universal," in what sense it may be either refused or claimed. Howbeit, understand thou, gentle reader, that all this is M. Harding's own only commentary. For other doctor or father he allegeth none.

M. Harding,
p. 186 b.

Addition. ¶ "But," M. Harding saith, "M. Jewel mis- *Addition.*
liketh with me for saying, that the name of 'universal bishop' in a right sense is no proud name, in respect of him to whom it belongeth. By a right sense, I mean that sense which St. Gregory allowed, and that which the fourth general council of Chalcedon allowed." *The answer.* But what is that right sense, M. Harding? "The same," you say, "that is allowed by the council of Chalcedon, and by St. Gregory." But what sense that may be, neither the council of Chalcedon, nor St. Gregory ever told you. Verily, St. Gregory having occasion largely to dispute hereof, even in the same sense and meaning as it was claimed by the bishop of Constantinople, saith, That the same title with the same sense was offered by the council of Chalcedon to the bishop of Rome. In the same sense, I say, M. Harding, and in none other: and in what sense it was offered by the council, in the same sense the pope refused it. The sense therefore being one, why do you so

¹³ [Harding adds: "For which cause the bishops of Rome that sithence have succeeded, keeping the thing, and embracing the humility of Gregory, use to subscribe themselves to this day thus, 'I N.

bishop of the catholic' (that is universal) 'church.' " See Replie, supra vol. ii. pp. 288, 289, where a similar observation of Harding's is refuted.]

vainly imagine such choice of senses? "The sense that was offered" (you say) "was good. The sense that was refused" (you say) "was naught." And yet both these senses were all one sense. Otherwise shew you me, where St. Gregory ever called himself the "universal bishop" in any kind of sense. Certainly, speaking of the same title of "universal bishop," and of the same sense, and of none other, he saith: *Petrus universalis apostolus non vocatur*: "St. Peter is not called the 'universal apostle.'" If this title and this sense never belonged unto St. Peter, how then may it belong unto the pope? Wherefore, M. Harding, touching the right sense of these words, I think him not in his right wits, that can devise such distinction of senses without any difference. Him St. Gregory meant to claim the name of "universal bishop," that sought to subdue all the members of Christ's church unto himself. And this is that selfsame title, and that selfsame sense, that this day is claimed by the pope, as it is evident unto the world. Pope Clement saith: *Omnes subjecti sunt motioni papæ: et sunt in illo, quasi membra de membro*: "All men are subject to the pope's will: and are in him, as members of a member." Durandus saith: *Omnes episcopi descendunt a papa, tanquam membra a capite*: "All bishops come from the pope, as members from the head." Another saith: *Papa est ordinarius totius mundi*: "The pope is the ordinary, or bishop of all the whole world." And therefore pope Bonifacius VIII. hath concluded by solemn sentence: "That every creature must submit itself unto the bishop of Rome upon the pain of everlasting damnation." This is the right sense, that you mean, M. Harding: thus the pope claimeth this day to be the "universal bishop." And this same title and sense is it, that St. Gregory condemneth. ➡

First, where it is said, that St. Gregory by this word "universal bishop" meant him, that would be bishop alone over all the world, excluding all others, this exposition is not only strange, but also vain, and fond, and void of reason. For what bishop of Constantinople ever was there, that called himself the "only bishop," and excluded all

Lib. 4. epist.
32. [ii. 748.]

Clem. lib. 5.
De Hæret.
Ad vestrum.
[leg. Ad nostrum, in
Glossa.]

Durand. de
Ministris et
Ordinib. lib.
2. [c. 1. 17.]

De Major. et
Obedient.
Unam Sanct.

others? Doubtless John, that first laid claim unto this name, as he called himself the “universal bishop,” so he wrote his letters unto others, and never refused to call them bishops.

But, to leave these glosses and phantasies, by the title of “universal bishop,” St. Gregory meant such a one, not as would be bishop alone, but as would claim infinite authority, and universal jurisdiction over all other bishops throughout the world: and that, as St. Cyprian saith, would call himself *episcopum episcoporum*: “the bishop of bishops.”

Cyprian. in
Concil. Car-
thag. [pp.
329, 330.]

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 38. [ii.
742.]

Therefore St. Gregory thus writeth unto John the bishop of Constantinople, the first usurper of this title: *Quid tu Christo universalis ecclesie capiti in extremi judicii responsurus es examine, qui cuncta ejus membra tibimet Universalis conaris appellatione supponere?* “What answer wilt thou make unto Christ the head of the universal church, when thou shalt be examined at the last judgment,” (not that thou hast called thyself the only bishop, but) “that thus goest about by the name of ‘universal bishop,’ to make all his members subject unto thee?” It was this immoderate universal jurisdiction that St. Gregory reproveth, and not the making of himself bishop alone, excluding all others.

Gregor. lib. 7.
epist. 30. [ii.
919.]

Likewise he writeth of himself unto Eulogius: *Beatitudo vestra mihi sic loquitur: SICUT JUSSISTIS. Quod verbum JUSSIONIS, peto, a meo auditu removete.....Non JUSSI: sed quæ utilia visa sunt, indicare curavi:* “Your holiness saith thus unto me” (being the bishop of Rome): “AS YOU HAVE COMMANDED. Have away this word of COMMANDING from my hearing, I beseech you. I COMMANDED you not: but that I took to be the best, I thought good to shew you.” The fault therefore that Gregory findeth with John the bishop of Constantinople, stood not in calling himself the “only bishop,” for so he never did, but in bidding, and commanding, and claiming universality of jurisdiction over the whole church of Christ. And for that cause he saith unto Eulogius: *Ecce in præfatione epistolæ, quam ad meipsum, qui prohibui, direxistis, superbæ appellationis verbum UNIVERSALEM ME PAPAM dicentes*

Gregor. lib. 7.
epist. 30. [ii.
919.]

imprimere curastis. Quod, peto, dulcissima mihi sanctitas vestra ultra non faciat : quia vobis subtrahitur, quod alteri plusquam ratio exigit præbetur : “Behold even in the title of your letter ye have written this ‘proud posy,’ naming me THE UNIVERSAL POPE: notwithstanding I have forbidden it. I beseech your holiness to do so no more. For whatsoever is given unto any other above reason, the same is taken from yourselves.”

M. Harding saith: “Gregory affirmeth the charge of the whole, and denieth the name of ‘universal.’ Let these defenders,” saith he, “grant the thing, and we strive not for the name.” Verily this play had been too vain for children, to allow the thing itself, and to cavil only about the name: that is to receive the body, and to shun the shadow: or, as Christ saith, to swallow a camel, and to strain a gnat. So Appian saith, Julius Cæsar nicely refused to be called a king: and yet in all manner authority and government, bare himself none otherwise than as a king.

Matt. xxiii.
24.
Appianus :
[Præf. ed.
Schw. i. 8.]
εἰς δὲ τὰ
ἔργα [leg.
ἔργα τὰ
πάντα] βα-
σιλεύς.

It was not the bare name of “universal bishop” that so much offended the holy fathers, but the pride, and tyranny, and universal government and jurisdiction, that is signified by that name. If the name were naught, then was the usurpation of the thing itself a great deal worse.

But, St. Gregory saith: “The charge and principality of the whole church was committed unto Peter.” This is not denied. In like sort Chrysostom saith: “The like charge and principality of the church was committed unto Paul.” For thus he writeth: ^a*Paulo totus orbis creditus est :—*^b*Paulus gubernat orbis ecclesiam :—*^c*Paulus universum gubernat orbem :* “Unto Paul the whole world is committed:” “Paul governeth the church of the world:” “Paul ruleth the whole world.” And yet Chrysostom meant not hereby, that Paul had the universal government of the whole: but that his care and charge was general, as not bound or limited unto one place, but indifferent and common unto all. So he saith: *Paulus tam anxie omnium salutem curabat, ac si totus mundus unica esset domus :* “Paul was so careful for the salvation of all men, as if the

a [Chrysost.
in Serm. de
Eleem. ed.
1588. tom. iv.
625.]

b Chrysost.
in Act. hom.
53. [ix. 402.]
c Chrysost.
de Laudib.
Pauli. hom.
2. [ii. 485.]

Chrysost. in
Hom. De
Profectu E-
vangell. [ed.
Paris 1588.
tom. iv.
1137.]

Chrysost. ad
Pop. Antioch.
hom. 73. [ed.
Paris 1588.
tom. v. 391.]

whole world had been but one house.” Again : *Paulum tangebatur sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum : non unius, aut trium, sed omnium, quæ erant per orbem terrarum* : “ Paul was moved with the care of all churches : not of one, or two, or three, but of all the churches throughout the world¹⁴.” Likewise he saith of St. John : *Columna erat omnium, quæ in orbe sunt, ecclesiarum* : “ He was the pillar of all the churches in the world¹⁵.” Likewise again of St. Matthew : *Matthæus universi orbis curam gerebat* : “ The whole world was under Matthew’s charge.”

Chrysost. in
Prologo in
Johan. [viii.
2.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
48. [vii. 491.]

Therefore, if M. Harding will gather out of these three words of St. Gregory (*TOTIUS ECCLESIE CURA*) that Peter had universal jurisdiction over all, it must needs follow by the same words, that Paul, John, and Matthew had the same jurisdiction over all. What other thing he hopeth to gain by these words of St. Gregory, I cannot tell : unless haply he will found his reason thus : St. Gregory saith : *Petrus universalis apostolus non vocatur* : “ Peter is not called the ‘universal apostle :’ ergo, the pope is the ‘universal bishop.’”

So handsomely these things are gathered together to serve the purpose.

“ Pope Leo,” ye say, “ of humility refused this name openly in the council of Chalcedon.” Indeed pope Gregory so reporteth it. Notwithstanding it appeareth not by any thing done in that council, that this title was ever offered him. And to refuse a thing before it be offered, it is no great point of humility.

To be short, the best we can gather hereof is this : John the bishop of Constantinople ambitiously craved this name : pope Leo godly refused it being offered unto him : the popes afterward gladly received it without offering. If it were a good name, why was it refused ? if it were an ill name, why was it received ?

¹⁴ [Chrysost. ad pop. Ant. 73. There were only twenty-one genuine Homil. ad pop. Ant. : this sentence occurs however in Chrysost. ad Genes. tom. iv. 90. See supra p. 364.]

¹⁵ [Chrysost. Prolog. in Joann. ὁ γὰρ τῆς βροτῆς υἱός, ὁ ἀγαπητὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ στύλος τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησιῶν, ὁ τὰς κλεῖς ἔχων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. . . .]

Now let us see what they of M. Harding's side have meant by this word "universal," and with what humility the popes have received the same. Thus therefore they write :

Papa totius orbis obtinet [leg. tenet] principatum : "The pope hath the princehood of all the world." And when the pope is consecrate, the chief minister saith unto him : *Ego investio te de papatu, ut præsis urbi et orbi* : "I do invest thee with the popedom, that thou mayest rule both the city and the world¹⁶."

And whereas M. Harding demandeth, how many popes have claimed this name, it may please him to remember, that in the late council of Constance it was not only claimed, but also published as an article of the faith. The words are these : *De necessitate salutis est credere, papam esse œcumenicum* : "It is of the necessity of salvation to believe, that the pope is the universal bishop¹⁷."

Of this universality of power Franciscus Zabarella writeth thus : *Papa jam occupavit omnia jura inferiorum ecclesiarum, ita, ut inferiores prælati sint pro nihilo* : "The pope hath now gotten the right of all inferior churches, so that the inferior prelates stand now for nothing."

For these causes Gregory calleth the name of 'universal bishop,' a profane, a presumptuous, a wicked, and an anti-christian name : comparing the usurper thereof with Lucifer and Antichrist.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. Divis. 1.

Further we say, that the minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred¹⁸ to that office of the church of God, and that no man hath power to

¹⁶ [There is some mistake in the marginal reference.]

¹⁷ ["Ad hæc Eckius concilii Constantiensis auctoritatem allegavit, ubi inter damnatos articulos Hussitarum est et hic, "De necessitate salutis est credere, "Romanum pontificem œcumenicum esse." Ursperg. Paral. ad ann. 1518. According to this, it would seem as if this proposition had been condemned not by Huss,

but by the council; but the context proves Jewel to be right; for Luther had just acknowledged the pope to be œcumenical; and Eckius contends that he is œcumenical *jure divino*. Luther's account of the Disputation at Leipsic corresponds.]

¹⁸ ["Ministrum legitime vocari oportere, et recte atque ordine præfici ecclesiæ Dei." Apol. Lat.]

^a In 6^o. de Statu Regulari, Periculoso. in Gloss.

^b Ceremonia. lib. 1. cap. 4.

^c Paralipome. Urspergen. De Disputatione Lapsica.

^d Francis. Zabarella. [fol. 243. col. 1. B. Synt. Tract. de Imp.]

wrest himself into the holy ministry at his own pleasure. Wherefore these persons do us the greater wrong, which have nothing so common in their mouths, as that we do nothing orderly and comely, but all things troublesomely and without order: and that we allow every man to be a priest, to be a teacher, and to be an interpreter of the scriptures.

M. HARDING.

Ye say, that the minister ought lawfully to be called (for so hath your Latin) and duly and orderly to be preferred to that office of the church of God. Why do ye not so? why is not this observed among your gospellers? Whatsoever ye mean by your minister, and by that office, ^athis we are assured of, that in this your new church, bishops, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, or any other inferior orders, ye have none¹⁸.....

a Untruth.
For it is
known we
have them.

For whereas after the doctrine of your new gospel, like the forerunners of Antichrist, ye have ^babandoned the external sacrifice and priesthood of the New Testament, and have not in your sect consecrated bishops, and therefore being without priests made with lawful laying on of hands, as scripture requireth, all holy orders being given by bishops only; how can ye say, that any among you can lawfully minister, or that ye have any lawful ministers at all?

b Untruth.
For we have
abandoned
neither the
priesthood,
nor the sacri-
fice, that
Christ ap-
pointed.

This then being so, let me have leave to oppose one of these defenders' consciences. And that for the better understanding I may direct my words to a certain person, let him be the author of this Apology, or because his name to me is unknown, let him be M. Jewel. For with him gladly would I reason in this point, the rather for acquaintance, and for that he beareth the name of a bishop in that church, where myself had a room. How say you, sir minister bishop, ought the minister to be lawfully called? ought he duly and orderly to be preferred to that office, or (as the Latin here hath) promoted, or put in authority over the church? In the Apology this defender saith, yea.

How many bishops can you reckon, whom in the church of Salisbury you have succeeded as well in doctrine as in outward sitting in that chair? how many can you tell us of, that being your predecessors in order before you were of your opinion, and taught the faithful people of that diocess the doctrine that you

¹⁸ [Harding adds: "In saying this, we speak not of our apostates that be fled from us to your congregation. Who as they remain in the orders which they received in the catholic church, so being divided and cut off from the church, and excommunicate, lawfully they may not minister the sacraments."]

teach? Did bishop Capon teach your doctrine? did Shaxton? did Campegius? did bishop Audley? briefly, did ever any bishop of that see before you teach your doctrine? ^c It is most certain they did not¹⁹.....

^c Untruth.
For bishop
Shaxton and
bishop Capon
taught the
same.

If you cannot shew your bishoply pedigree, if you can prove no succession, then whereby hold you? will you shew us the letters patent of the prince? Well may they stand you in some stead before men: before God, who shall call you to an account for presuming to take the highest office in his church ^d not duly called thereto, they shall serve you to no purpose.

^d Untruth.
For he was
chosen by
canonical
election of
the chapter,
as all other
bishops have
been before.

In præscrip-
tionibus ad-
versus Hæ-
reticos. [cap.
32. p. 213.]
These be
Tertullian's
words.

You know what Tertullian saith of such as ye be: *Edant originēs ecclesiarum suarum*, &c. We say likewise to you, M. Jewel, and that we say to you, we say to each one of your companions; "Tell us the original and first spring of your church. Shew us the register of your bishops continually succeeding one another from the beginning, so as that first bishop have some one of the apostles, or of the apostolic men, for his author and predecessor. For by this way the apostolic churches shew what reputation they be of. As the church of Smyrna telleth us of Polycarp by John the apostle placed there. The church of the Romans telleth us of Clement ordained by Peter." St. Augustine having reckoned up in order the bishops of Rome to Anastasius successor to Siricius, who was the eight and thirtieth after Peter, saith that in all that number and roll of bishops there is not found one that was a Donatist: and thereof he concludeth, *ergo*, the Donatists be not catholics. So after that we have reckoned all the bishops of Salisbury from bishop Capon upward, we shall come at length, in respect of doctrine and orders, to St. Augustine the apostle of the English, who was made bishop by Gregory, and from Gregory upward to St. Peter. And in all that row of bishops, ^e we shall find never a one that believed as M. Jewel believeth. *Ergo*, your Zuinglian and Calvinian belief, M. Jewel, and of the rest of your fellows, is not catholic.

^e Untruth,
by your own
confession.

Therefore, to go from your succession, which ye cannot prove, and to come to your vocation, how say you, sir? You bear yourself as though you were bishop of Salisbury. But how can you prove your vocation? by what authority usurp you the administration of doctrine and sacraments? what can you allege for the right and proof of your ministry? who hath called you? who hath laid hands on you? by what example hath he done it?

¹⁹ [It will be remembered that bp. Jewel expressly gave notice (supra vol. iv. p. 142.) that he should omit such passages in Harding's Confutation as were irrelevant. The present Editor has thought it right to notice any of such passages, which may appear in his judgment to be important. In

this place Harding adds, "Howsoever those two first-named only in some part of their life taught amiss, how afterwards they repented, abhorred your heresies, and died catholics, it is well known." These are the two, Shaxton and Capon, whom Jewel mentions in his marginal note.]

Epist. 165.
[Augustin.
Opp. tom. ii.
121.]

f Even he that gave M. Harding orders in the time of king Edward.

g Untruths two together in one sentence. See the answer.

h A vain untruth. For if it had been anything it had been a communion, and not a mass. But Athanasius saith plainly: *Neque ecclesia ibi erat, neque sacra fiebant neque tempus mysteriorum agebatur.*

M. Harding's brethren apostates.

how and by whom are you consecrated? who hath sent you? who hath committed to you the office you take upon you? Be you a priest, or be you not? if you be not, how dare you usurp the name and office of a bishop? if you be, tell us ^fwho gave you orders? The institution of a priest was never yet but in the power of a bishop. Bishops have always after the apostles' time, according to the ecclesiastical canons, been consecrated by ^gthree other bishops, with the consent of the metropolitan, and confirmation ^gof the bishop of Rome.

Macarius a priest of Athanasius (as it was laid to his charge ^{Athanas, in Apolog. 2.} by his accusers) pulled Ischyra from the altar as he was at ^hmass, overthrew the holy table, brake the chalice. The matter brought to judgment, Athanasius and those bishops both denied the fact, and also though it were granted, yet defended the same as well done, because Ischyra was not a lawful minister of the church. And why so? Because he was not lawfully made priest, nor with churchly laying on of hands consecrated²⁰.....By which example, besides other points, we are taught, what to judge of your pretended communion.

Again, what say you to Epiphanius, who writeth against one ^{Contra Hæreses, lib. 2.} Zacchæus of his time, for that being but a layman, with wicked presumption took upon him to handle the holy mysteries, and rashly to do the office of a priest²¹.....Hereof St. Hierom saith notably: *Hilarius cum diaconus de ecclesia recesserit, &c.:* "Hilary forasmuch as he went from the church being a deacon, ^{In Dialogo contra Luciferanos.} and is only (as he thinketh) the multitude of the world, can neither consecrate the sacrament of the altar, being without bishops and priests, nor deliver baptism without the eucharist. And whereas now the man is dead, with the man also the sect is ended, because being a deacon he could not consecrate any clerk that should remain after him. And church is there none, which hath not a priest. But letting go these few of little regard, that to themselves be both lay and bishops, listen what is to be thought of the church." Thus St. Hierom there: in whom, leaving other things, I note, that if there be no church where is no priest, where is your church like to become, after that our apostates, that now be fled from us to you, shall be departed this life²²?.....Therefore this being true, it remaineth, M. Jewel, you ^{Sacerdotem. If p. 59.} tell us, whether your vocation be ordinary or extraordinary. If it be ordinary, shew us the letters of your orders. At least shew

²⁰ [Harding here enlarges upon the well-known story of Ischyra and Colluthus.]

²¹ [Harding farther alleges two other instances, noticed by Epiphanius, of unauthorized intrusion into the priest's office. The truth is, that all Harding's instances are quite harmless weapons as against

the church of England.]

²² [Bucer and Luther are here named as giving their involuntary testimony to the necessity, ordinarily speaking, of the accustomed form of ordination. But what has this to do here, as alleged against the Orders of the church of England?]

us that you have received power to do the office you presume to exercise, by due order of laying on of hands and consecration.

^k But order and consecration you have not. For who could give that to you of all these new ministers, howsoever else you call them, which he hath not himself? If it be extraordinary, (as all that ye have done hitherto is besides all good order,) shew us some sign or miracle. If you fail in all these, why ought not you to be put away?

^k a manifest untruth. For we have both order and consecration.

Lib. 1. epist.
5. [p. 152.]
Euseb. Eccl.
Hist. lib. 6.
cap. 43. in
Græco.

Finally, what can you answer to that, which may be objected to you out of St. Cyprian's epistle to Magnus touching Novatian? It was at those days a question, whether Novatian baptized and offered, specially whereas he used the form, manner, and ceremonies of the church. Cyprian denieth it. For he cannot, saith he, be counted a bishop, who, setting at nought the tradition of the gospel and of the apostles, *nemini succedens a seipso ordinatus est* [leg. *ortus est*], "succeeding no man is ordained bishop of himself. For by no means may one have or hold a church, that is not ordained in the church."

This being so, we do you no wrong, as ye complain, in telling you and declaring to the world, that touching the exercise of your ministry, ye do nothing orderly or comely, but all things troublesomely and without order. Unless ye mean such order and comeliness as thieves observe among themselves in the distribution of their robberies.

M. Harding's modesty.

Lastly, if ye allow not every man, yea and every woman, to be a priest, why drive ye not some of your fellows to recant, ^l that so have preached? why allow ye the books of your new evangelists, that so have written?

^l An odious untruth. For touching the ministry of the church, we have neither preached so, nor written so.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here hath M. Harding taken some pains more than ordinary. He thought, if he could by any colour make the world believe, we have neither bishops, nor priests, nor deacons this day in the church of England, he might the more easily claim the whole right unto himself. And indeed, if it were certain that the religion and truth of God passeth evermore orderly by 'succession,' and none otherwise, then were 'succession,' whereof he hath told us so long a tale, a very good substantial argument of the truth. But Christ saith: *In cathedra Mosi sedent scribe et Pharisei*: (by order of 'succession') "the scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair." Annas and Caiphas, touching 'succession,' were as well bishops as Aaron and Eleazar. Of 'succession' St. Paul saith to the faithful at Ephesus:

Matt. xxiii. 2.

Acts xx. 29. *Scio quod post discessum meum intrabunt lupi rapaces. Ex vobis ipsis exsurgent viri perversa loquentes*: "I know that after my departure hence, ravening wolves shall enter and 'succeed' me. And out of yourselves there shall" (by 'succession') "spring up men speaking perversely."

Dist. 40. Non est facile. Therefore St. Hierom saith: *Non sanctorum filii sunt, qui tenent loca sanctorum*: "They be not always the children of holy men, that" (by 'succession') "have the places of holy men."

M. Harding, p. 199 a. M. Harding, p. 199 b. *Addition.* ☞ "Nay," saith M. Harding, "you bring *Addition.* these words as in the reproach of succession: whereas Christ of the same made an argument for succession. Could you not perceive that Christ made a plain argument, why, and why only, the scribes and Pharisees should be obeyed? Thus Christ saith: Obey them only for succession's sake, because by order of succession they sit in Moses' chair. This place so maketh for succession, that it can never be avoided." *The answer.* And think you indeed, M. Harding, that the scribes and Pharisees came from Moses by 'succession,' as the pope would seem to come from Peter? were they the dukes and princes of the country, as Moses was? or were they the high priests or bishops, as was Aaron? or had they continued their estate and doctrine even from the time of Moses until Christ, well near by the space of two thousand years? Certainly St. Hierom saith: "The scribes and Pharisees grew out of two houses of Jewry, the one called Sammai, the other Hillel, not long before Christ was born:" *non multo prius quam dominus nasceretur.* And Josephus saith: The Pharisees were first brought to the government of the state by the policy of Alexandra, after the death of Alexander her husband, which was not above threescore years before Christ. Now, M. Harding, if the scribes and Pharisees had neither the office of Moses, nor his doctrine, nor his laws, nor his sword, but only had shifted in themselves so many years after him, how then can you say, "That Christ commanded them to be obeyed only for succession's sake, for that by order of succession they had placed themselves in Moses' chair?" Indeed they had set themselves in the

In Esa. cap. 8. [iii. 79.]

Joseph. Antiqu. lib. 13. cap. 21.

room of Moses, and were his successors, as touching place : but other 'succession' of continuance, or universally of every part of doctrine, I know none. Universally, I say, and of every part : for otherwise in many parts they taught Moses' law, and taught it truly. Howbeit, as the scribes and Pharisees succeeded Moses, perverting and breaking the laws of Moses : even so do the bishops of Rome this day succeed Christ, perverting and breaking the laws of Christ.

But, I pray you, did Christ command the people to obey the Pharisees whatsoever they said, true or false, only because of their 'succession?' Wherefore then said he to his disciples, "Beware of the leaven of the scribes and Pharisees?" "Blind they are, and lead the blind, and both fall into the pit." "They break the laws of God to uphold their own traditions." "They are thieves and murderers." "They seek only to destroy and kill." "They shut up the kingdom of God before men." Yet will you tell us, that Christ commanded the people to follow the Pharisees absolutely, and without exception, breaking and defacing God's holy laws : shutting up the kingdom of God : destroying and killing the souls of God's people : and leading them headlong into the pit? Nay, M. Harding, Christ rather saith : "My sheep hear my voice, and follow me : and will not hear the voice of strangers." By strangers he meant the scribes and Pharisees, and other like. For full answer hereto, St. Augustine saith thus : *Sedendo in cathedra Moysis, legem Dei docent, &c.* : "Sitting in the chair of Moses, they teach the law of God. Therefore it is God, that teacheth in them. But if they will teach any thing of their own, then" (saith St. Augustine) "hear it not, then do it not."

Thus, M. Harding, you see, neither had the Pharisees due 'succession' and continuance from Moses, no more than the pope hath from St. Peter : nor did they universally and in all points teach the true meaning of Moses' law : nor did Christ will the people universally and absolutely to obey them. So much this place maketh for your 'succession.'

Notwithstanding, the pope himself will say, as it is before alleged: *In papa si desint bona acquisita per meritum, sufficiunt quæ a loci prædecessore præstantur*: "If the pope want good things gotten by his own merits, the good things which he hath" (by 'succession') "of Peter his predecessor are sufficient." And the Gloss thereupon: *Petrus fecit papas hæredes bonitatis suæ*: "Peter made the popes heirs of his goodness" (by 'succession'). And again: *Papa sanctitatem recipit a cathedra*: "The pope receiveth his holiness" (by 'succession') "of his chair."

Dist. 40.
Non nos.

Dist. 19. Sic
omnes: in
Gloss.

M. Harding,
p. 204 a.

Addition. ¶ The effect of M. Harding's answer hereto *Addition.* is this: "The pope may be holy, although not by virtue that should be within him, yet by his office that is without him." *The answer.* And yet it is universally confessed among the learned, that holiness is a virtue, and, that virtue is an ornament of the mind, and is within us. *Sanctitas est virtus: virtus est habitus animi.* But the pope hath a privilege above others, and may be holy without holiness. So the scribes and Pharisees, and Annas, and Caiphas, were they never so wicked, might be holy by their office. And so by this conclusion it may stand well with reason, that wickedness and holiness may dwell together. But St. Hierom saith: *Si quis hominem, qui sanctus non est, sanctum esse crediderit, et Dei eum junxerit societati, Christum violat, cujus membra sumus*: "If any man believe that man to be holy that is not holy, and will join him to God's company, he doth villainy to Christ, whose members we are." ¶

Causa. 11.
quæst. 3. Si
quis homi-
nem.

Such affiance sometime had the scribes and Pharisees in their 'succession.' Therefore they said: "We are the children of Abraham:" "Unto us hath God made his promises:" "Art thou greater than our father Abraham?" "As for Christ, we know not from whence he came," or what he can shew for his 'succession.' And when Christ began to reform their abuses and errors, they said unto him: "By what power doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?" where is thy 'succession? Upon which words Beda saith: *Intelligi volunt, diaboli esse quod facit*: "They would have the people understand" (for

John viii. 33.

John ix. 29.

Luke xx. 2.

Mark xi. 28.

Beda in Luc.
lib. 5. cap.
80. [leg. cap.
81.]

that he had no solemn 'succession') "that all that he did was of the devil." And Cyrillus frameth their words in this sort: *Tu, ortus ex Juda, commissos nobis fasces usurpas*: "Thou, being of the tribe of Juda," (and therefore having no right by 'succession' unto the priesthood) "takest upon thee the office that is committed unto us." Likewise Chrysostom imagineth the Pharisees thus to say: *Tu de sacerdotali familia natus non es: senatus tibi hoc non concessit: Cæsar non donavit*: "Thou art not of the house of priests: the council hath not granted it thee: the emperor hath not given it thee." Thus to maintain themselves in credit, for that they had 'succession' and continuance from Aaron, and sat in Moses' chair, they kept Christ quite out of possession: and said unto him then, even as M. Harding now saith unto us: Whoever taught us these things before thee? what ordinary 'succession' and 'vocation' hast thou? what bishop admitted thee? who confirmed thee? who allowed thee?

Cyrril. in Cæ-
tena [aurea]
in Luc. xx.

Chrysost. in
Matthæ.
hom. 39. in
Opere Im-
perfecto. [vi.
app. 164.]

Addition.

Addition. ¶ But M. Harding saith: "Christ had a most perfect succession from Adam, till Joseph the husband of the Virgin Mary." *The answer.* I grant, as touching his birth, Christ had his 'succession' from Adam downward. So hath every man living, whatsoever he be. Even you yourself, M. Harding, are lineally descended from Adam by undoubted 'succession,' although unknown: unless we shall think, ye were born without father or mother, and are none of Adam's children. But we speak not now of 'succession' of birth, but of 'succession' of office. And you know the office of priesthood, whereof the Pharisees spake, was never in the house of David, that is reckoned in Luke and Matthew, but only in the house of Levi. Otherwise tell me, in that whole race of David's descent, who was ever accounted a priest, or offered the sacrifice, or had ordinary power to teach the gospel before Christ? You do over vainly abuse your reader, thus confounding and blending your things together. Touching the ordinary office of priesthood, and instructing the people, whereof we speak, Christ saith plainly: "As many as came before me, they were thieves and murderers." As

if he would say unto them: "I have no ordinary descent from the bishops and priests of the house of Levi. I am able to shew you no such succession. My living Father hath sent me to you." Consider better what you write, M. Harding, ye shall the less deceive the simple.

M. Harding,
p. 210 a.

Further you say: "St. Peter's chair to the new law is that which Moses' chair was to the old law." Who told you this tale, M. Harding? in what scripture may we find it? Your own word carrieth no such credit. Prove it better, that we may believe you. Hereto ye add further: "Whatsoever king, or queen, or priest setteth up a succession against Peter's chair" (you mean, that is not obedient to the pope) "before Christ's second coming, is a schismatic, and without repentance shall be damned in hell fire with idolaters for ever." And is this your definitive sentence, M. Harding? or may not a poor man appeal from it? Indeed so said pope Bonifacius in his vanity: "I have decreed and determined," saith he, "that every creature be subject to the bishop of Rome, upon the necessity of his salvation." Thus all other Christians whatsoever, dwelling in Græcia, Armenia, Africa, Asia, Ethiopia, India, &c. must needs be damned. For certainly they never knew any such subjection to the pope. But God be thanked, St. Peter himself, of whose chair we speak, saith thus: "Before God there is no difference nor choice of persons: but in every nation, whosoever feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable unto him." But of any such necessity of obedience to the see of Rome, he telleth us nothing. 

De Major. et
Obedient. U-
nam sanctam.

Therefore, good Christian reader, let not these M. Harding's great words much abash thee. The scribes and Pharisees in the like cases used the like language long ago.

Touching the church of Rome, I will say no more for this present, but only that was spoken openly by Cornelius the bishop of Bitonto, in the late council of Trident: *Utinam non a religione ad superstitionem, a fide ad infidelitatem, a Christo ad Antichristum.....velut prorsus unanimes declinassent*: "Would God they were not gone as it were utterly by consent together, from religion to superstition,

Cornel. Epi-
sc. Bitontin.
in Concil.
Trident.
[Conciones
in Concil.
Trident. ed.
Lovan. 1567.
p. 15. col. 1.]

from faith to infidelity, from Christ to Antichrist²³." These few words, considering either the speaker, or the place where they were spoken, may seem sufficient. They are gone from faith to infidelity, from Christ to Antichrist. And yet, all other things failing, they must hold only by 'succession:' and only because they sit in Moses' chair, they must claim the possession of the whole. This is the right and virtue of their 'succession.'

The words of Tertullian, M. Harding, which you have here alleged, were spoken of certain your ancient fathers that had raised up a new religion of themselves, as you have also done, without either word of God, or example of the apostles and holy fathers. And therefore he saith, not unto us, but unto you and such as you be: *Edant origines ecclesiarum suarum*: "Let them shew forth the originals of their churches." Even so we say unto you, shew us the originals of your doctrine: shew us any one of the apostles of Christ, or of the learned catholic doctors of the church, that ever said your private mass: shew one at the least, either Greek or Latin. St. Augustine saith, of so many bishops of Rome there could not one be found that had been a Donatist. Even so in like sort say we to you, of all the same bishops of Rome, there cannot one be found that ever agreed with M. Harding in saying mass. Or if there were any such, shew us his name, with other circumstances, when, and where, and who were witnesses of the doing. Shew us your originals, M. Harding: confess the truth: deceive us no longer: it is a new device: ye have it only of yourselves, and not by 'succession' from the apostles.

Augustin.
epist. 165.
[ii. 121.]

Addition. ¶ Hereto M. Harding answereth: "You say M. Harding,
not even right so as Tertullian said: for he called not for P. 217.
the originals of doctrine, but of churches. For by the churches the doctrine is known to be good or evil, to be allowable or reprovable." *The answer.* I grant, M. Harding, great and worthy is the authority of the church of God: yet is not the truth of God's gospel always known by the name of the church: but contrariwise, the true

Augustin.
contra Cres-
con. lib. 1.
cap. 33. [ix.
407.]

Chrysost. in
Opere Im-
perf. hom. 94.
[vi. app.
204.]

M. Harding,
p. 218 a.

Art. 1. Div.
34. [Vol. i.
p. 325.]

M. Harding's
Confut. p.
192 a. b.

Iren. lib. 3.
cap. 3. [p.
176.] et lib. 4.
cap. 4.
Euseb. lib. 5.
cap. 6. [i.
217.]
Epiphani. lib.
1. De Corpo-
rat. [i. 107.]
Optatus con-
tra Donatist.
lib. 2. [cap.
3.]

church is always known by the gospel. St. Augustine saith unto Cresconius: *Ecclesiam sine ulla ambiguitate sancta scriptura demonstrat*: "The holy scripture sheweth forth the church without doubtfulness." And the author of the book called *Opus Imperfectum*, speaking purposely hereof, saith thus: *Ideo mandat ut Christiani.....volentes*, &c.: "Therefore Christ commandeth that Christian men, willing to be assured of the true faith, resort to nothing else but only to the scriptures. For if they have regard to any thing else, they shall be offended and perish, not knowing which is the true church."

Further you say: "It is clear, that St. Chrysostom said mass, and yet had no man to receive with him." *The answer*. This is all untrue, M. Harding. For your credit's sake prove it better. It is evident by Chrysostom, that when he ministered the holy communion, great multitudes, as well of the lay people as also of the clergy, received with him. For proof whereof it may please thee, good reader, to consider some part of my Reply to M. Harding.

Again you say: "We say private mass because the popes, and other bishops, who sit in Peter's and in other the apostles' chairs, do tell us that it is lawful to say private mass." *The answer*. If this rule be infallible, then happy are you. Following the pope whithersoever he lead you, you can never go amiss. This is that mystery that ye have disclosed to the world in your late Confutation. Thus you say: "It shall be sufficient for us to do as Peter's successors bid us to do: Christ now requireth not of us to obey Peter or Paul, but him that sitteth in their chair," that is, the pope. ➡

But wherefore telleth us M. Harding this long tale of 'succession?' have these men their own 'succession' in so safe record? who was then the bishop of Rome next by 'succession' unto Peter? who was the second? who the third? who the fourth? Irenæus reckoneth them together in this order: Petrus, Linus, Anacletus, Clemens: Epiphanius thus: Petrus, Linus, Cletus, Clemens: Optatus thus: Petrus, Linus, Clemens, Anacletus. Clemens saith, that he himself was next unto Peter: and then must the

reckoning go thus : Petrus, Clemens, Linus, Anacletus. Hereby it is clear, that of the four first bishops of Rome, M. Harding cannot certainly tell us who in order succeeded other. And thus talking so much of 'succession,' they are not well able to blaze²³ their own 'succession.'

I might farther say that Peter's see apostolic was over the Jews, and not at Rome over the heathens. For so St. Paul saith : *Mihi concreditum est evangelium præputii*, Galat. ii. 7. *sicut Petro circumcisionis : qui potens erat Petro in apostolatu circumcisionis, potens erat in me inter gentes* : "The gospel of the uncircumcision among the heathens was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision among the Jews unto Peter : God that was mighty in Peter in the apostleship of the circumcision, was mighty in me among the heathens." Therefore if the pope this day will claim only by Peter's title, and require no more than Peter had, then must he seek his primacy among the Jews, where Peter had his jurisdiction limited, and not at Rome among the heathen Christians, among whom, as St. Paul saith, he had not much to do.

Addition. *Addition.* ¶ Here saith M. Harding : "The lewdness of this licentious minister passeth all reason. His malicious and fond conceit : you are so impudent : shame it is to you, M. Jewel : the shame of ignorance I mean : or which is more likely, the shame of impudency." *The answer.* You are liberal, M. Harding. It is your good will, I should want no shame. Of lewd and licentious ministers I have no skill. Such licentious speech might well be spared. But why are you so impatiently moved without cause ? You say : "I exclude not only the pope, but also St. Peter from the government of his own chair in Rome." You may not bear false witness, M. Harding, be you never so angry. "The mouth that seeketh such advantages, killeth the soul." You know full well, we exclude not the pope from the government of his own chair in Rome. Otherwise why should we so oftentimes call him the bishop of Rome ? God give him grace, that he may

M. Harding,
p. 221 a.
222 a.

²³ [To blaze=to blazon.]

1 Cor. iv. 1.

so govern his chair, as the servant of Christ, and the steward of God's mysteries : lest his chair be laid to his confusion. St. Hierom saith : " It is no easy matter to stand in the place of Peter and Paul, and to hold the chair of them now reigning with Christ²⁴." And Chrysostom saith, as he is alleged by Gratian : *Non cathedra facit sacerdotem, sed sacerdos cathedram* : " It is not the chair that maketh the priest, but it is the priest that maketh the chair."

Hieronym.
ad Heliodo-
rum. [iv. pt.
2. 11.]

40. Dist.
Multi.
In Opere
Imperfecto,
hom. 43. [vi.
app. 183.]

But I have said : " St. Peter's see apostolic was over the Jews." This is it that hath offended you. Yet I said not, his see was only over the Jews, utterly excluding all manner heathens. Behold my words better. Thus I say, speaking of the agreement taken between Peter and Paul : " At Rome among the heathen Christians St. Peter had not much to do." " This," you say, " is lewdness, and impudency, and ignorance, and a malicious and fond conceit : " and I know not what. I beseech you, M. Harding, and doth not St. Paul say the same ? Did not Peter and Paul divide the charge between themselves, that Peter, James, and John should have the Jews for their portion : and Paul and Barnabas for their portion should have the heathens ? be not these St. Paul's own express and plain words : " When James, Peter, and John, that are taken as the pillars, or chief among them, had known the grace that was given to me, they joined with me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should preach among the heathens, and they in the circumcision among the Jews ? " Weigh well these words, M. Harding. What signify they ? what mean they ? was not this the conclusion of their agreement, that James, Peter, and John should use their apostolic authority over the Jews : and Paul and Barnabas their like authority over the heathens ? If you can devise us any other exposition hereof, I pray you shew it. Origen, writing upon the gospel of St. Matthew, expoundeth it thus : " Peter and Paul gave right hands of fellowship the one to the other, that Peter should go unto the circum-

Origen. in
Matth. tract.
14. [iii. 743.]

²⁴ [Hieron. ad Heliodor. " Non " nere gradum Petri, jam in cœlo
" est facile stare in loco Pauli, te- " regnantium."]

cision, to preach unto the Jews living under the law, as unto an ass under the yoke : but Paul should go unto the heathens, as unto a colt that had never been broken."

St. Augustine expoundeth it thus : " They agreed, that Paul and Barnabas should go to the heathens : and themselves, James, Peter, and John unto the circumcision, which seemed contrary to the heathens." Augustin. in Epist. ad Galat. lib. 1. [iii. pt. 2. 947.] St. Hierom thus :

Unus atque idem, &c. : " One God hath committed unto me the preaching of the gospel among the heathens : and to Peter among the Jews. He sent me unto the Gentiles, and placed Peter in Jewry.....By God's providence one apostle is given to the Jews, and another unto the heathens." Hieron. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. 2. [iv. 240.]

Chrysostom thus : " One thing pleased them both, that Peter and his side should preach to the Jews : and Paul and Barnabas to the heathens." Afterward he imagineth St. Paul thus to say : *In prædicandi munere partiti sumus inter nos orbem terrarum* : " In the office of preaching we have divided the world between ourselves." Chrysost. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. 2. [x. 685.]

And a little before he saith thus : *Paulus nihil opus habebat Petro, nec illius egebat voce, sed honore par erat illi. Nihil enim hic dicam amplius* : " Paul had no lack of Peter, nor stood in need of his voice : but in honour was his peer. I will say no more."

St. Ambrose saith thus : " Paul saith that the grace he had received of God was allowed of them, that he might be thought worthy to have the primacy in preaching among the heathens, as Peter had in preaching among the Jews²⁵." Ambros. ad Galat. cap. 2. [ii. app. 216.] Anselmus, a latter writer, saith thus :

" These two principal apostles were chosen to the salvation of two peoples : Peter to the salvation of the Jews, and Paul to the salvation of the heathens." Anselmus in Epist. ad Galat. cap. 2. [ii. 236. B.]

What shall we need mo authorities in a matter so evident? This is the exposition of all the learned fathers, both Greeks and Latins. Yet will you still tell us : " The lewdness of this licentious minister passeth all reason?" will you still cry out : " Shame, impudence," and " ignorance," &c.?

But you say : " I have left out this word *enim*, which in English doth signify, ' for. ' This word ' for, ' " you say, M. Harding, p. 222 a.

²⁵ [This commentary on the Epistles is not genuine.]

"giveth great light to St. Paul's meaning." A foul fault, no doubt, M. Harding, and well worthy to be proclaimed by printed books unto the world. Perhaps ye would rather I had begun the first sentence with *enim*, as doth your Hippolytus²⁶. But if there be any such special virtue in *enim*, let him come in again hardly, M. Harding, and take his place. Theophylactus upon this *enim* hath written thus: *Quin etiam parem hoc loco se Petro demonstrat*: "Yea further Paul in this place sheweth himself to be equal to Peter."

Theoph. in
Epist. ad
Galat. cap. 2.
[ed. Lat.
1531. fol. 75.]

Chrysostom.
ad Galat.
cap. 2, [x.
684.]

† Hieronym.
ad Galat.
cap. ii. [v.
1038.]

Likewise upon the same *enim* saith Chrysostom: "Now Paul sheweth himself to be equal in honour unto the rest: not only unto others, but also unto" (Peter) "the chief of all." Likewise it is written in the short Scholies, that bear the name of St. Hierom: *Ego in nullo sum illi inferior*: "I," saith St. Paul, "am in nothing inferior unto Peter." Verily if he thought not himself inferior to Peter, then he thought not Peter to be his head.

Now have you your *enim*, M. Harding, and, as we may learn by these ancient fathers, the very light of St. Paul's meaning: that is, that Paul should deal among the heathens, and Peter among the Jews. And therefore Erasmus expoundeth it thus: *Fœdus ac societatem inierunt, ut idem evangelium concordibus animis in sua quisque portione prædicaremur: illi inter Judæos, nos inter gentes*: "They joined in league and fellowship with us, that with consenting minds we should preach one gospel, each man within his own portion: they among the Jews, and we among the heathens." Thus were they charged by their own agreement, each of them within his own particular portion. By their own agreement, I say. For otherwise Christ saith, not only to Peter, but also equally unto them all: "Go you into the whole world, and preach the gospel." But by this commission Thomas and Thaddee might have preached in Rome, as well as Peter. By their own agreement they knew their portions. It is no even dealing, M. Harding, to divide portion between two or more, and afterwards to give over the whole to one alone.

Erasmus,
Paraphr.

Mark xvi. 15.

²⁶ [See ante, vol. i. p. 181.]

Here will you say: "Had Peter then nothing to do among the heathens? or, had Paul nothing to do among the Jews?" Yes verily, M. Harding. For we know that Peter preached unto the heathen centurion: and Paul oftentimes entered into the synagogues of the Jews, as by the Acts of the Apostles it may appear: and of himself he saith thus: *Factus sum Judæis quasi Judæus*: "Unto the Jews I was as a Jew." And again: "I wish myself to be accursed and divided from Christ, for (the Jews' sake, which are) my brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh." Acts ix, 22, 26.
1 Cor. ix, 20.
Cupio anathema esse.

Wheresoever they saw occasion offered, they were always ready to do good to all men, without choice of persons, whether they were Jews or heathens.

Howbeit, this question is very well moved and answered by St. Hierom. Thus he saith: *Occulta hic oritur quæstio. Quid igitur: Petrus si invenisset ex gentibus, non eos adducebat ad fidem? aut Paulus, &c.*: "Here ariseth a secret question: If Peter had found any of the heathens, did he not train them to the faith? or if St. Paul had happened upon any of the Jews, did he not exhort them to be baptized?" This question, saith he, is thus assailed. "We must say that either of them had a principal or a special commission, the one over the Jews, the other over the heathens: that the Jews, that defended the law, might have one whom to follow: and the heathens, that chose rather the free grace of God, and left the law, might likewise have a teacher to go before them. But generally this purpose was common to them both, that out of all nations, as well Jews as heathens, they might gather a church unto Christ." That is to say, Peter's apostleship was "ordinary" among the Jews, and "extraordinary" among heathens: of the other side, Paul's apostleship was "ordinary" among the heathens, and "extraordinary" among the Jews. Hieronym. ad Galat. cap. 2. [iv. 24 t.]
Principale singulis in Judæos et gentes fuisse mandatum.

Thus much have I added for your sake, M. Harding. For otherwise it had been needless. Hereby it is evident: "That by God's secret providence, and by the apostles' agreement between themselves, Peter was placed in Jewry, and Paul among the heathens:" for so saith St. Hierom: "That Paul had the primacy among the heathens, as Peter had among the Jews:" for so saith St. Ambrose: "That

Paul was equal unto Peter:" for so saith Chrysostom: "That Paul was in no point inferior unto Peter:" for so saith he that beareth the name of St. Hierom: "Briefly, that either of them was allotted to his several portion, and neither had the charge universal of the whole." This is neither lewdness, nor licentious ministry, nor shame, nor villainy. Leave such wild talk, M. Harding, and learn your tongue to speak better. ➡

Where you say, that according to the ecclesiastical canons, ever from the apostles' time bishops have evermore been consecrate by three other bishops, with the confirmation of the bishop of Rome, as if without him no man might be allowed to be a bishop, ye should not so unadvisedly report so manifest untruth. For, I beseech you, where be these ecclesiastical canons? who devised them? who made them? who gave the pope that singular privilege, that no bishops should be admitted in all the world, but only by him? I remember your canonists have said:

Felin. de
Constitu. Ca.
Canonum
Statuta. [fol.
10.] colum. 6.
Ver. Fallit.

Panor. de
Constitution.
Translatio.
[tom. 1. fol.
19. col. 2. l.]

M. Harding's
Confutat. 58
a. [Detect.
223. a.]

Papa potest solo verbo facere episcopum: "The pope may make a bishop only by his word," without any farther consecration. And abbot Panormitane moveth a doubt, whether the pope by the fulness of his power may deprive all the bishops in the world at one time. But thus they say, that care not greatly what they say.

Addition. ➡ M. Harding answereth hereto: "Among Addition. the canons of the apostles this is the first: *Episcopus a duobus aut tribus episcopis ordinetur*. Yet can you ask, Where be these ecclesiastical canons? who devised them? who made them?" *The answer.* You forget yourself much, M. Harding. This was not the question. You are demanded one thing, and answer another. We deny not the consecration of three bishops. We deny not the confirmation of the metropolitan. We ourselves are so consecrated, and so confirmed. The matter that lieth between us is this: "Whether through the whole church of Christ no man may be allowed for a bishop without the confirmation of the pope." Thereto I say, Where be your ecclesiastical canons? who devised them? who made them? If ye have any, shew them forth hardly: they will further your cause. If ye have none at all, why should you thus

vaunt yourself of empty store? why should you talk so vainly of your ecclesiastical canons, so old, so ancient, so long continued in the catholic church, from the apostles' time until this day?

"Christ," you say, "loved Peter, and inspired him, and gave the bishop of Rome, Peter's successor, this privilege, that no bishop ought to be a bishop without his consent." Verily this had been a jolly large commission. And was it granted unto the pope, as you say, and not unto Peter? For so you say. Behold your words: "Christ gave the bishop of Rome, Peter's successor, this privilege: that no bishop ought to be a bishop without his consent." Of Peter's privilege or consent you tell us nothing: you speak only of the consent and privilege of the pope, the 'successor' of Peter. But where may we find this commission? in what gospel? in what scripture? in what general council? in what ancient father? are such monuments laid up only in the Rolls and Pipes²⁷ of your memory? Or is it sufficient for you to tell us, "Christ inspired and loved Peter, Christ gave privileges to the pope," without any manner word of proof? I beseech you, M. Harding, how many bishops can you reckon that were confirmed by St. Peter? where dwelt they? where preached they? what were their names? Cardinal Cusanus saith: *Tam Petri primatus inter apostolos et Judæos, quam Pauli primatus inter gentes immediate a Christo conferebatur*: &c. *Nec in hoc alter alteri suberat: sed ambo sub Christo immediate*.....: "As well Peter's primacy among the apostles and Jews, as also Paul's primacy among the heathens, was given by Christ immediately," (that is to say) "without the consecration and confirmation of any man, &c. And in this respect neither of them was under other: but either was immediately under Christ." That is to say, St. Paul was no more confirmed by St. Peter, than St. Peter was confirmed by St. Paul. And may we think, St. Peter knew not his own authority? or that he had such privileges and charters given him by Christ, and would not use them? Here, it seemeth, somewhat would ye tell us of pope Anacletus, if ye wist what it were. But

M. Harding's
Detection,
fol. 223 b.

Nicol. Cusa.
ad Bohæm.
epist. 2. [p.
836.]

²⁷ [This is an allusion to the and the Pipe-Rolls of the Ex-Rolls of the Court of Chancery, chequer.]

what saith he? that Peter confirmed all the rest of the apostles? or, that the pope ought to confirm all other bishops through the world? It pitieth me, M. Harding, in your behalf, to see these follies. 

Nilus de Pri-
matu Romani
Pontificis.
[lib. 2. p. 29.]

Verily, Nilus a Greek writer saith thus: *Constantinopolitanus Cæsariensem episcopum, aliosque sibi subiectos ordinat: Romanus vero nec Constantinopolitanum, nec alium quenquam metropolitanum*: "The bishop of Constantinople doth order the bishop of Cæsarea, and other bishops under him: but the bishop of Rome doth order neither the bishop of Constantinople, nor any other metropolitan."

M. Harding,
fol. 225 a.

Addition.  M. Harding answereth hereto: "It skilleth *Addition.*

not much what Nilus doth say. He speaketh of a matter of fact, and not of power. He saith not that the bishop of Rome is not able, or hath no power, to order some metropolitan: but only that he doth not so. Or if he were so foolish to think so, yet you, M. Jewel, should not in that behalf bear the bable²⁸ with him. You that can call so many glosses to your remembrance, could you not remember that Agapetus that good bishop of Rome consecrated and ordered with his own hands Mennas, making him bishop of Constantinople?" *The answer.* And must Nilus and poor M. Jewel needs bear the bable? I pray you, M. Harding, what will you do the while? will you stand by and do nothing? Verily Nilus was a bishop, and, as it may appear by his writings, a learned man, and would think scorn to bear the bable in your presence.

M. Harding,
225 b.

But you say: "Could you not remember that pope Agapetus with his own hands ordered Mennas, and made him the bishop of Constantinople?" Yes, M. Harding, I remember it very well. And further, I can remember that

Liberat. cap.
21. [p. 147.]

Liberatus your author saith: *Tunc papa principis favore Mennam ordinavit antistitem*: "The pope," saith he, "ordered Mennas the bishop of Constantinople" (not by any right or authority of his own, but) "by the license and favour of the emperor." Again, I can remember that pope Agapetus was then present in Constantinople, to deal with the emperor about certain great matters touching the state. And being there present in his own person, and a

Liberat. cap.
21. [p. 146.]
Liber. eod.
loco.

²⁸ [The fool's bawble.]

new bishop being by occasion to be installed, it was most meet that he should have the honour of consecration. And, as for the taking of that long and painful journey, thus much also I can remember, that whensoever the emperor by his messenger had willed the pope to come unto him, although it were from Rome to Constantinople, straightway he went along, all occasions set apart, yea, although he certainly knew that he should never return home again, but be sent into banishment. Further, I can remember, that pope Agapetus himself said thus at the time of the said consecration, in the behoof and commendation of the said Mennas: *Et hoc dignitati ejus accedere credimus, quod a temporibus Petri apostoli nullum alium unquam orientalis ecclesia suscepit episcopum nostræ sedis manibus consecratum*: “This also may be an augmentation to his dignity, that from the time of Peter the apostle until this day,” (which was by the space of five hundred years,) “the east church never received any one bishop consecrate by the hands of any bishop of Rome, but only Mennas.” Mennas was the first, as it appeareth by the pope’s own witness: and, for ought that I know to the contrary, he was also the last. And had not pope Agapetus upon occasion been there present in his own person, then had he not consecrated Mennas neither. Consider better what ye bring us, M. Harding. Ye shall hardly thrive by such authorities. Last of all, I can remember, that the bishop of Rome himself is always consecrate by the bishop of Hostia. Yet is not the bishop of Hostia therefore above the bishop of Rome. It is no great mastery to remember these things, M. Harding. But I marvel much, wherein this remembrance should relieve you. ➡

Addition.

But hereof I have spoken more at large in my former Reply to M. Harding. Certainly St. Cyprian willeth, that Sabinus, being lawfully elected and consecrated bishop in Spain, should continue bishop still, yea although Stephanus, being then bishop of Rome, would not confirm him²⁵.

Addition. ➡ “By this a man may know, what a dodger

Eutrop. in
App. in Syl.
verio.

Concil.
Const. 5.
act. 2. [al.
act. 1. vill.
923.]

Art. 4. Divis.
25. [Supra
vol. ii. p.
254.]
Cyprian. lib.
1. epist. 4.
[p. 119.]

M. Harding,
226.

²⁵ [Supra vol. ii. p. 258, note 74.]

you are, and whence your great books proceed. Verily from certain heretical notebooks, made by some grammarians or schoolmasters of Germany." *The answer.* I marvel, M. Harding, you said not as well from tailors and shoemakers: for we poor men must take our learning at delivery, as it may like you to allow it. The matter itself by your own confession is true. For St. Cyprian willed, that Sabinus, being once elected and consecrated bishop in Spain, should continue so still, yea although the bishop of Rome had disallowed him. If ye doubt hereof, leave dodging in your notebooks, and read St. Cyprian, and ye shall find it. Twice together in one place ye tell us, that pope Stephanus restored Basilides by his decree: as if his only authority had been sufficient to set up bishops, and to pull them down at his pleasure. But in so saying, you condemn pope Stephanus of manifest folly. For what wisdom had it been to be so ready with his sentence, and to publish his decrees, before he had heard both parties together? A judge must walk with feet of lead. A certain grave wise man saith thus:

Cyprian, lib.
1, epist. 4.
[p. 119.]

Seneca.

*Qui statuit aliquid, parte inaudita altera,
Æquum licet statuerit, haud æquus fuit:*

"Whosoever decreed any thing before he heard both parties, although his decree were just, yet was he no just man in his doing."

Pope Stephanus, M. Harding, entreated only for Basilides, that he might be restored. As for decree or sentence in judgment, he gave none. But if St. Cyprian had made such account of the pope's pleasure, and had thought it unlawful for Sabinus to occupy the room of a bishop without his special confirmation, he would have written unto Stephanus, to call the parties before him, and to consider better of the matter. He would also have written to the clergy and people of Spain, to stay their attempts until the pope had taken further order. But contrariwise, notwithstanding he knew what the pope had written, yet he saith unto them: *Plebs ipsa habet potestatem, vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi:* "The people have power of themselves, either to choose worthy bishops, or

Cyprian, lib.
1, epist. 4.
[p. 119.]

else to refuse them that be unworthy." As if he would say, Thus may the people do of themselves, whether the pope will or no.

And to come near unto the matter, thus he saith : *Fere per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem, cui præpositus ordinatur, episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique convenient, et episcopus deligatur, plebe præsentē, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, &c. Quod et apud vos factum videmus in Sabini collegæ nostri ordinatione, &c. Neque rescindere ordinationem jure perfectam potest, quod Basilides post crimina sua detecta..., Romam pergens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum...fefellerit* [leg. *fefellit*], &c. : "This order is kept wellnear throughout all countries, that at the consecration of a bishop, the bishops of the same province next adjoining resort together to the people of that diocess, over which the bishop must be consecrate, that the bishop may be chosen in the presence of the people, that best knoweth each man's life. This order, I see, you have kept in the consecration of my brother Sabinus. Neither may that thing hinder his consecration, being lawfully done, that Basilides, after his faults were espied, went to Rome, and beguiled my brother pope Stephanus dwelling so far off." Mark well these words, M. Harding: Neither Basilides running to Rome, nor the pope's letters written in his favour, were able to avoid the consecration of the other bishop, notwithstanding it was never confirmed by the pope.

But you will say: "The bishop of Rome dwelling so far from Spain, yet had authority over the bishops of Spain." I deny it not. So had St. Cyprian the like authority, notwithstanding he dwelt from Spain a great way further than the bishop of Rome. For as Basilides fled to Rome for succour to pope Stephanus, so Sabinus his adversary fled to Carthage for succour to St. Cyprian. As the pope decreed that Sabinus should not be bishop, so St. Cyprian decreed that Sabinus should be bishop. There was like authority in them both. This only was the difference: The pope's decree was avoided by a writ of error:

but St. Cyprian's decree took place and continued still. And lest you should think I imagine vainly of St. Cyprian extending his power from Carthage into Spain, Gregory Nazianzen of his authority writeth thus: *Pastor erat, et pastorum potentissimus, et spectatissimus. Non enim Carthaginensium tantum ecclesie præfuit*, &c.: "Cyprian was a bishop, the mightiest and noblest of all bishops. For he had rule not only over the church of Carthage, nor only over Africa, that until this day is famous of him, and by his means, but also over all the west, and in a manner over all the east, likewise over both north and south." Over all these coasts and countries, saith Nazianzen, St. Cyprian bare rule: and yet was he only the bishop of Carthage, and not pope of Rome. O, M. Harding, if you could shew us but one such sentence of the pope, who should be able to stay your triumph? Deal substantially henceforth. It will better become you. Thus vainly trifling with your grammarians and notebooks, (to use your own words,) ye shew yourself to be but a dodger. ☞

Nazian. De Cypriano. [l. 445.]

Προκαθέ-
ζεται.

Dist. 64.
cap. fin.

Indeed, touching every metropolitan's several jurisdiction, Gratianus noteth thus: *Illud generaliter clarum est, quod si quis præter sententiam [leg. conscientiam] metropolitani fuerit factus episcopus, hunc magna synodus definit episcopum esse non oportere*: "This is generally clear, that if any man be made bishop, without the consent of his metropolitan, the great council" (of Nice) "hath decreed, that such a one may not be bishop."

Socrat. lib. 7.
cap. 28. [tom.
ii. p. 377.]
χειροτονίαν
ἐπισκόπου
μὴ γίνεσθαι.

So likewise saith Socrates of the bishop of Constantinople: *Præter sententiam episcopi Constantinopolitani electio episcopi ne fiat*: "Without the consent of the bishop of Constantinople let no man be chosen bishop²⁶." Here is a right specially reserved to the bishop of Constantinople, and to every metropolitan within his own province: but of the bishop of Rome's universal right of confirmation, we hear nothing.

M. Harding,
fol. 227 a.

Addition. ☞ Hereto, M. Harding saith: "For lack of Addition.

²⁶ [Socrates. . . . ἀμελήσαντες τίνον πόλεως χειροτονίαν ἐπισκόπου τοῦ νόμου τοῦ κελεύοντος, παρὰ μὴ γίνεσθαι.]
γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταν-

the pope's confirmation, any bishop newly elected could not rightly have enjoyed his bishopric, as it appeareth by many examples, which would require a discourse over long for this place." *The answer.* O, M. Harding, will you deal so straitly with your friends? of so many and so many examples, may we not see so much as one? I speak not now of bishops within the territory of the Roman province. For they were confirmed by the bishop of Rome. I speak of the bishops of all other churches and jurisdictions throughout the world. You say: "It would require a discourse over long for this place." Therefore it was good skill thus cursorily to pass it over. Silence serveth best where nothing can be said. ➡

Neither doth M. Harding's counterfeit Anacletus claim all the bishops through the world as belonging to his admission, but only a part. These be his words: *Omnes episcopi, qui hujus apostolicæ sedis ordinationi subjacent*: "All the bishops that are under the ordering or confirmation²⁷ of this apostolic see." So likewise writeth Damasus to the bishops of Illyricum: *Par est, omnes, qui sunt in orbe Romano, magistros consentire*: "It is meet that all the teachers within the Roman jurisdiction should agree together²⁸."

Anaclet.
epist. 3.
Dist. 93.
Juxta Sanct-
orum.

Sozomen. lib.
6. cap. 23.
[tom. ii. p.
247.]

Addition.

Addition. ➡ M. Harding's answer hereto is this: "The Roman world or jurisdiction was both east and west, as far as the Romans had conquered." *The answer.* And doth the jurisdiction of Rome reach from the east to the west: from the north to the south, and so over and over the whole world? how happeneth it then, that no learned father nor ancient writer, Greek or Latin, whatsoever, vouchsafed ever to tell us of it? did no man ever hear it, or know it, but M. Harding? or is it enough for M. Harding to speak it, and to shew us nothing? At least he should have brought forth Constantine's Donation, or some other such antiquity of like value. But if the Roman jurisdiction

Fol. 228 a.

²⁷ [Harding finds fault with Jewel for making "ordering" and "confirmation" of bishops the same thing.]

²⁸ [In Mansi iii. p. 443. the

reading is, "Unde justum est, omnes in universo Romanorum orbe doctores legis, ea quæ legis sunt sapere, et non fidem doctrinis variis maculare."]

Hieronym.
ad Evagrium.
[iv. pt. 2.
803.]

Gennadius
in Con. Con-
stantinopol.
[Concill.
Labb. tom.
iv. p. 1029.]

were so large as it is here imagined, wherefore then doth St. Hierom say: *Major est autoritas orbis, quam urbis?* "The authority of the world is more than the authority of the city of Rome?" For by M. Harding's supposals, the one had been equal to the other. Or wherefore doth Gennadius the patriarch of Constantinople, together with the whole council of bishops there assembled, write thus unto the bishop of Rome: *Curet sanctitas tua.....universas tuas custodias, tibi que subjectos episcopos*: "Let your holiness see unto your own charge, and unto the bishops that be under you." It had been wrong to restrain the pope to a few, having, as you say, a charge general over the whole. ☞

Petr. de Pa-
lude De
Potestate
Apost.
Seneca.

Johan. Major
in 4. Sent.
dist. 24.
quest. 3.

Again, that you say: "A bishop hath always been consecrate by other three bishops:" whether it be true or no, it may well be called in question, as being of your part hitherto very weakly affirmed. Surely Petrus de Palude, one of your own doctors, would have told you thus: *In ecclesia unus episcopus sufficit ad alium consecrandum: nec est nisi propter solennitatem ab ecclesia inventum, ut tres concurrant*: "In the church one bishop is sufficient to consecrate another: and it is nothing else, but for the solemnity of the matter, that the church hath devised, that three bishops should join together." Likewise Johannes Major, another of your own doctors, would have said unto you: *Quis ordinavit Petrum? Non dabunt tres ordinatores. Dico ergo, esse constitutionem humanam, quod episcopus ordinetur a tribus. Paulus enim non quæsit duos pro ordinatione Titi et Timothei*: "Who ordered Peter, and made him bishop? They cannot shew me three bishops that ordered him. Therefore I say, that a bishop be ordered by other three bishops, it is an ordinance made by man. For Paul, when he ordered Titus and Timotheus, sought not about for other two bishops."

Whereas it further pleaseth you to call for my letters of orders, and to demand of me, as by some authority, "Whether I be a priest or no? what hands were laid over me: and by what order I was made?" I answer you, I am a priest, made long sithence, by the same order and ordinance, and I think also by the same man, and the same

hands, that you, M. Harding, were made priest by²⁹, in the late time of that most virtuous prince king Edward the Sixth. Therefore ye cannot well doubt of my priesthood, without like doubting of your own.

Further, as if ye were my metropolitan, ye demand of me: "Whether I be a bishop or no?" I answer you, I am a bishop, and that by the free and accustomed canonical election of the whole chapter of Salisbury, assembled solemnly together for that purpose. Of which company you, M. Harding, were then one, and, as I was informed, being present there in your own person amongst your brethren, gave free and open consent unto the election. If you deny this, take heed your own breath blow not against you³⁰.

As for the impertinent tales of Ischyra and Zacchæus, they touch us nothing. They were none of ours: we know them not. Our bishops are made in form and order, as they have been ever, by free election of the chapter: by consecration of the archbishop³¹ and other three bishops: and by the admission of the prince. And in this sort, not long sithence, the pope himself was admitted: and, as Platina saith, without the emperor's letters patent the pope was no pope, as hereafter it shall be shewed more at large.

Platina in
Severino
Papa.

Addition. ¶ "What form or order mean you?" (saith M. Harding.) "In the old form, after the election, notice was given to the bishop of Rome and to all the bishops of the church, that such a man was lawfully chosen in the church, and not schismatically," &c. "But so ye were not made bishops. If ye were, shew us to what bishops out of England ye wrote any such letters." *The answer.* What

M. Harding,
fol. 234 a.

²⁹ [Harding (in his Detect. fol. 231 b.) says, "I only took the Order of Deaconship, as it was then ministered; farther I went not." The name of the bishop who conferred priest's Orders on Jewel has not been recorded.]

³⁰ [Harding (Detect. fol. 233.) admits that he was at the time Prebendary and Treasurer of the church of Salisbury, but says that he purposely absented himself from the election. For the truth of this,

he appeals to the Register, and to other members of the Chapter.]

³¹ [It is worth observing, that Harding in his Detection, fol. 234 b. while he denies the validity of archbishop Parker's consecration, on the alleged ground that there were not "three bishops in the realm to lay hands upon him," makes not the slightest allusion to the Nags' head story: one proof amongst many, that it was a later invention.]

folly is this, M. Harding? what such letter have the bishops of Spain used to write to the bishops of England? or what letters have the bishops of France used to write to the bishops of Spain? or when did the pope write his letters communicatory to the patriarchs of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, or to the other bishops of the east? But you confess, this order is broken by yourselves. Behold your own words. Thus you say: "The custom of these letters is out of use." And having broken it yourselves, M. Harding, would ye have us to keep it? or would ye have us to reverence those things, that yourselves have refused?

Fol. 234 b.

But you say: "After that the custom of those letters became to be out of use, the only bishop of Rome's confirmation was instead of the said notice." Thus you say, and say it only, and prove nothing: as if there were some weight in your saying. But who made us these laws? where sprang they? when began they? in what synod, in what council were they written? If ye had any good thing to shew, it is likely ye would not hide it. ☞

Therefore we neither have bishops without church, nor church without bishops. Neither doth the church of England this day depend of them whom you so often call apostates, as if our church were no church without them. They are no apostates, M. Harding: that is rather your own name, and of good right belongeth unto you. They are for a great part learned and grave and godly men, and are much ashamed to see your follies. Notwithstanding, if there were not one neither of them nor of us left alive, yet would not therefore the whole church of England flee to Lovaine. Tertullian saith: "*Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, regnum quoque, et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo nos fecit. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiæ autoritas, et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus a Deo. Ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offert, et tingit sacerdos, qui est ibi solus* [Ben. leg. et offers et tingis, et sacerdos es tibi solus]. *Sed et ubi tres sunt, ecclesia est, licet laici. Unusquisque enim de sua fide vivit*: "And we being laymen, are we not priests? It is written, Christ hath made us both a kingdom and priests

Tertullian in
Exhort. ad
Castitatem.
[cap. 7. p.
522.]

unto God his Father: the authority of the church, and the honour by the assembly or council of order sanctified of God, hath made a difference between the lay and the clergy. Whereas there is no assembly of ecclesiastical order, the priest being there alone," (without the company of other priests,) "doth both minister the oblation, and also baptize. Yea, and be there but three together, and though they be laymen, yet is there a church. For every man liveth of his own faith."

Addition.

Addition. ¶ For answer hereto, M. Harding hath yielded us words enow. "A thousand faults," he saith, "and many thousand lies are in my books. Ye would blush," he saith, "if any shame were in you," &c. The total sum hereof is this: "Tertullian was an heretic, and wrote this book against the church: there is a difference between priests and laymen: there is priesthood internal, and priesthood external: where the external priesthood is denied, as among the Lutherans and Calvinists, there is no church," &c. M. Harding, fol. 238 a. Fol. 240 a.

Touching the first part hereof, I grant Tertullian in some part fell from the truth of God, even as you have also, M. Harding, and followed Montanus the heretic in his errors. The errors of Montanus were these: first, he said: "He knew more than the apostles of Christ: and that the apostles' knowledge was uncertain, and wanted perfection." Further he said: "That second marriage was fornication and filthiness." But the thing wherein you have taken hold, touching priests and lay people, was no part of Montanus' errors. If it were, bring it forth out of some record: let it appear, that we may see it. Neither may you justly conclude, because Tertullian in one or two points was an heretic, that therefore every sentence in his book is full of heresies. As for these words, he had them not out of Montanus the heretic, but out of St. Peter the apostle of Christ. Thus saith St. Peter: *Vos estis regale sacerdotium*: "You are the kingly priesthood." And thus he saith, not only unto priests and bishops, but also unto the whole Christian people. Likewise St. John the evangelist saith: "Christ with his blood hath washed 1 Pet. ii. 5. Rev. i. 5.

us from our sins, and hath made us kings and priests unto God his Father.” But ye tell us: “There is a priesthood internal, and a priesthood external, and there is a difference between laymen and priests.” What needed this talk, M. Harding? There is not one of us, that ever taught otherwise. We know, that the priest or minister of the church of God is divided from the rest of his brethren, as

Numb. viii. 6. was the tribe of Levi from the children of Israel, and hath
Deut. x. 8. a special office over the people. Neither may any man force himself into that office without lawful calling. But as touching the “inward priesthood,” and the exercise of the soul, we say, even as St. Peter, and St. John, and Tertullian have said: in this sense every faithful Christian man is a priest, and offereth unto God spiritual sacrifices. In this only sense, I say, and none otherwise.

Now, if any man shall think it strange to hear a layman in any sense called a priest, may it please him to peruse some part of that hereafter followeth in this Defence. There shall he find by the authorities of St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Hierom, and St. Chrysostom, that whosoever is a member of Christ’s body, whosoever is a child of the church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth his name, is fully invested with this priesthood, and therefore may justly be called a priest. And wheresoever there be three such together, as Tertullian saith, yea though they be only laymen, yet have they a church.

The old father Origen saith: *Omnes quicumque unguento sacri chrismatis delibuti sunt, fiunt sacerdotes*: “All they that are bathed with the ointment of holy chrism are made priests.” St. Augustine saith: *Holocaustum Domini-nicæ passionis offert quisque pro peccatis suis, &c.*: “Every man offereth up the sacrifice of our Lord’s passion for his sins.” Likewise St. Cyprian: *Omnes, qui a Christi nomine dicuntur Christiani, offerunt Deo quotidianum sacrificium, ordinati a Deo sanctimonie sacerdotes*: “All men, that of the name of Christ be called Christians, offer up unto God the daily sacrifice, being ordained of God the priests of holiness.” Thus we see, all Christian men are priests, and offer up to God the daily sacrifice, that is, the sacrifice

Numb. viii. 6.
Deut. x. 8.

Defens. pt. 6.
cap. ii. div.
4. et 5. [p.
576. fol. ed.
1609.]

Origen. in
Levit. hom.
9. [ii. 243.]

Augustin. in
Exposition.
Inchoata, ad
Roman. [ii.
pt. 2. 937.]

† Cyprian.
de Uctione
Chrismatis.
[app. cxxiv.]

of Christ's passion. Therefore, M. Harding, if ye condemn Tertullian in this behalf, ye must also condemn so many holy and learned fathers for the same.

"But you protestants," ye say, "have no external sacrifice; and therefore ye have no church at all." It pitieth me, M. Harding, to see the vanity of your dealing. Have we no external sacrifice, say you? I beseech you, what sacrifice did Christ or his apostles ever command, that we have refused? Leave your misty clouds and generalities of words, and speak it plainly, that ye may seem to say some truth.

We have the sacrifice of prayer, the sacrifice of alms-deeds, the sacrifice of praise, the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and the sacrifice of the death of Christ. We are taught to present our own bodies as a pure, and a holy, and a well-pleasing sacrifice unto God, and to offer up unto him the burning oblation of our lips. "These," saith St. Paul, "be the sacrifices, wherewith God is pleased." These be the sacrifices of the church of God. Whosoever hath these, we cannot say he is void of sacrifice. Howbeit, if we speak of a sacrifice propitiatory for the satisfaction of sins, we have none other but only Christ Jesus the Son of God upon his cross. "He is that sacrificed Lamb of God, that hath taken away the sins of the world."

You will say: "Ye offer not up Christ really unto God his Father." No, M. Harding: neither we nor you can so offer him: nor did Christ ever give you commission to make such sacrifice. And this is it, wherewith you so foully beguile the simple. Christ offereth and presenteth us unto his Father. "For by him we have access to the throne of grace." But no creature is able to offer him. Christ Jesus upon his cross was a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedek. As for our part, St. Augustine saith: *Holocausti ejus imaginem [leg. sacrificii similitudinem] ad memoriam passionis suæ (in ecclesia) celebrandam dedit [leg. commendavit]*: "Christ hath given us to celebrate in his church an image or token of that sacrifice for the remembrance of his passion." Again he saith: *Hujus sacrificii caro, et sanguis.....post ascensionem [leg. ascensum] Christi per sacramentum memorie cele-*

M. Harding,
fol. 240 a.

Rom. xii. 1.

Hosea xiv. 2.

Heb. xiii. 16.

John i. 29.

Heb. iv. 16.

Augustin. in
lib. 83.
quest. quæ.
61. [vi. 34.]

Augustin.
contra Faust.
lib. 20. cap.
21. [viii. 348.]

Euseb. de
Demonstrat.
lib. 1. [cap.
10. p. 40.]

Hieronym.
in Psal. 1. [ii.
pt. 2. 254.]

bratur: "After Christ's ascension into heaven, the flesh and blood of this sacrifice is continued by a sacrament of remembrance." Eusebius saith: *Sacrificium incendimus illi memoriam magni illius sacrificii*, &c. *Jussit nos offerre memoriam pro sacrificio*: "We burn a sacrifice unto God, the remembrance of that great sacrifice upon the cross³¹," &c. "Christ commanded us to offer up a remembrance (of his death), instead of a sacrifice." It were an infinite labour to report all that may be said. To be short, St. Hierom saith, turning himself unto Christ: *Tunc acceptabis sacrificium, vel cum te pro nobis offers Patri, vel cum a nobis laudes, et gratiarum actiones accipis*: "Then shalt thou, O Christ, receive sacrifice, either when thou offerest up thyself for us unto thy Father," (which was only upon the cross,) "or else, when thou receivest of us praises and thanksgiving."

All these things are true, M. Harding: you cannot deny them. You may therefore lay up the thousand faults, and so many thousand lies, with the shame and blushing that ye speak of. Slander no more, neither Montanus nor Tertullian. Though in some points they were deceived as heretics, yet herein they were catholic, and agreed with others the godly learned fathers of the church. God's name be blessed for ever, we want neither church, nor priesthood, nor any kind of sacrifice that Christ hath left unto his faithful. ☞

Again ye demand of me: "What bishop of Salisbury ever sithence Augustine's time maintained this doctrine?" I might likewise, and by as good authority demand of you, what bishop of Rome ever before the same English Augustine's time maintained your doctrine? or, as I said before, what bishop of Rome ever before that time either said or knew your private mass?

Fol. 241 a.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "The questions are not like, M. Jewel: many things have been, or might have been, lawfully concluded between this and Augustine's" (the Italian monk's) "time, albeit the same had not been used before," &c. *The answer.* I grant you, M. Harding, many pretty things have sprung up within these thousand years, your half communions, your private masses, your

Addition.

³¹ [Supra, vol. iii. p. 356, note 54.]

unknown prayers in strange tongues, your adoration of images, your pardons, &c. But how well, and how lawfully, it were hard to say. Verily these be the things, that neither Peter ever planted, nor Paul ever watered.

M. Harding. "All the bishops of Rome, as well before Augustine" (the monk's) "time, as sithence, maintained our religion. That I prove, because the bishop of Rome that now is doth allow our religion. For we communicate with him, and he with us. And this pope agreed with his predecessor Pius the Fourth: and so upward from pope to pope," &c. *The answer.* This, doubtless, is a mighty full argument, and concludeth from pope to pope, *a primo ad ultimum*. By this reason ye might very well justify Annas and Caiaphas. For either of them followed the bishops their predecessors, that had been before them, and so upward unto Aaron, that was the first. Yet Christ saith unto them: "Ye have broken the commandments of God to maintain your own traditions:" "From the beginning it was not so:" "They are blind guides, and lead the blind:" "They have defaced the house of God, and turned it into a cave of thieves." M. Harding, fol. 241 b.
Matt. xv. 6.
Matt. xix. 8.
Matt. xv. 14.
Matt. xxi. 13.

By the same reason ye may say thus: The bishop of Rome that now is, alloweth the stewes: and therein we communicate with him, and he with us: for in all catholic towns and countries of our religion, open stewes be maintained, as well as in Rome. And this pope agreeth with his predecessor Pius the Fourth: and he again with his predecessor Paulus the Fourth: and so upward from pope to pope, &c.: *ergo*, St. Peter, that was the first bishop of Rome, maintained the stewes. So weighty, M. Harding, be the arguments that you send us.

M. Harding. "But, seeing M. Jewel can name no man who began to say or allow private mass, and yet seeing it is said and allowed throughout all Christendom, it is St. Augustine's own rule, that the said use of private mass came from the apostles themselves. For thus he writeth: *Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec in conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi autoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur*: 'What thing the whole church keepeth, and hath not been instituted in councils, but hath been

M. Harding, fol. 242 a.

always retained, the same is most rightly believed to have been delivered none otherwise than by apostolic authority.' ” *The answer.* St. Augustine’s rule I like very well, M. Harding: but your unhandsome using and applying of the same, I cannot like. For the matters ye speak of are no way applicable to the rule. Mark, I beseech you, St. Augustine’s words: *Quod universa tenet ecclesia: quod semper retentum est*: “That thing,” saith St. Augustine, “that the whole universal church useth: that thing that hath always and evermore been observed.” Such a thing must it be, M. Harding, if ye will have St. Augustine’s rule to agree unto it. Now think you, that your private mass hath been universally allowed throughout the whole church of God? Indeed ye have said so: but ye have said it full untruly, as in place hereafter more convenient it shall appear³². Or think you, that your private mass hath been holden and used always, and evermore from the beginning? or if it be so, is your learning or your luck so ill, that for the space of so many hundred years, out of the records of so many learned fathers, with such conference of study, such help of friends, such time and such leisure, ye are not able to shew us one good proof, neither of place where it is said, nor of priests that said it, nor of witness that heard it? No, no, M. Harding, if you stand to St. Augustine’s rule, then must your mass needs be condemned. It was never universally used throughout the whole church of God: it hath not been continued always and evermore from the beginning: St. Augustine himself, St. Hierom, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and other holy fathers never knew it, nor heard of it: therefore it was never delivered from the apostles.

Howbeit, you say: “You cannot tell when your private mass first began, or who was the first that ever said it.” God be thanked, that thus hath forced you to utter some truth. Yet are we able to tell you, when the holy communion first began. We know, in what place and at what time it was first ministered: we know, that Christ Jesus the Son of God was the first that ever said it.

But because ye are not able to shew us the antiquity

Defens. pt. 5.
cap. xv. div.
1, [p. 510. fol.
ed. 1609.]

³² [See also the Replie, art. 1. vol. i. p. 157.]

and first originals of your mass, must we therefore think, M. Harding, that Christ or his apostles were the first that ever said it? or is your ignorance cause sufficient to prove it good? What if you cannot tell, as I reckon you cannot, in what time, or under what pope, your stews and pardons were first devised? will you therefore tell us, and must we believe, that Christ and his apostles first devised them? As for your private mass, you yourself have confessed, It grew not, either from the apostles, or of the Spirit of God, but only of the negligence and want of devotion of the people. Christ saith by way of a parable unto his disciples: "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man that sowed good seed in his ground: but when the folks were asleep, that man's enemy came, and sowed tares and cockle among the corn." Christ is the husbandman: he planted the holy communion in his church: and so it continued many hundred years. Afterward, when the priests and bishops became careless and fell fast asleep, the devil came with negligence, and ill disposition, and want of devotion of the people, and planted your mass. The servants said to their master: "Sir, did not you sow good corn in your field? from whence then be these tares?" Even so may we say: Did not Christ deliver us the holy communion, that the people should feast and communicate together, and publish the benefits of his passion? from whence then is this private banquet, that one man receiveth all alone? The servants knew not, who sowed the tares: neither do you know, who founded your mass. Notwithstanding, there is no less difference in the church of God between your mass and the holy communion, than is in the field between wild tares and wholesome corn. The one was planted by day, the other by night. But Christ saith: "Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be taken up by the root." ➡

M. Harding
in his An-
swer, fol.
12 B.

Matt. xiii. 24.

Touching the bishop of Salisbury, you yourself have already named two, bishop Shaxton and bishop Capon, both learned and grave fathers, and both preachers and professors of the gospel. For the rest of the bishops that were before them, what faith they held, and what they either liked or disliked, by their writings or sermons it

doth not greatly appear. I trust they held the foundation, and lived and died in the faith of Christ. If they had lived in these days, and seen that you see, they would not have been partakers of your wilfulness.

[Detect.
245 a.]

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “These be the words of an Antichrist, who seeking to make himself equal with Christ, doth use such phrases by his wicked members.” *The answer.* The sobriety of these words needeth no answer. ☞

To be short, we succeed the bishops that have been before our days. We are elected, consecrate, confirmed, and admitted as they were. If they were deceived in any thing, we succeed them in place, but not in error. They were our predecessors, but not the rules and standards of our faith. Or rather, to set apart all comparison of persons, the doctrine of Christ this day, M. Harding, succeedeth your doctrine, as the day succeedeth the night : as the light succeedeth darkness : and as the truth succeedeth error.

Now, forasmuch as ye have thought it so good to examine the petite degree of the bishop of Salisbury, I trust ye will not think it ill, if I a little touch the like in the bishops of Rome : that we may thereby be the better able to see some of the branches of your succession. Therefore shortly to say, you know that pope Marcellinus committed idolatry.

Addition. ☞ To this M. Harding answereth : “ Yet this very idolater, because he was St. Peter’s successor, and sat in the first see, was in case, for the room he occupied, to be judged of no man in the earth, as the council of the three hundred and thirty bishops assembled at Sinuessa pronounced above twelve hundred years past.” *The answer.* The reason hereof is declared in a council holden about the same time at Rome by Sylvester the First : *Præsul summus non judicabitur a quoquam : quia scriptum est, Non est discipulus supra magistrum* : “ The highest prelate shall be judged of no man. For it is written, There is no scholar above his master³³.” Thus the pope is the school-master, and all the bishops through the world are his

Concill. Rom.
i. [Mansi ii.
615 c.]

Matt. x. 24.

³³ [Richard Analys. Concill. vol. i. p. 234 maintains that the Acts of this council (A. D. 315.) are spurious.]

scholars, and may not control him, whatsoever he do: and all this he claimeth by the authority of the scriptures. If it be so, M. Harding, then is it true that the accusers of pope Symmachus said in the presence of king Theodoricus: *Successores Petri, una cum sedis privilegiis, peccandi quoque licentiam accepisse*: "That the popes, Peter's successors, together with the privileges of their see, have received liberty to do ill."

Ennodius,
Concil. tom. i.
[Apol. pro
synod. Bibl.
Patr. tom. xi.
p. 133.]

Indeed the council of Sinuessa used the pope Marcellinus with much courtesy, as it may appear. Yet, good reader, that thou mayest see the simplicity and plainness of M. Harding's dealing, whereas he saith, It was decreed by the council of Sinuessa, that Marcellinus, being Peter's successor, should be judged of no man in earth, he might also have told thee, that the same pope Marcellinus the idolater, notwithstanding the 'succession' of St. Peter, and all the privileges of his see, is found five times not only judged, but also condemned in the same council. And, for that the matter itself is not otherwise weighty, saving that it may witness the truth of M. Harding's reports, for shortness' sake I will lay forth the words thereof only in Latin without translation.

Thus therefore it is written in the council of Sinuessa²⁸:

Introivit et Marcellinus urbis Romæ episcopus, adhuc nomen tenens episcopatus: nondum enim fuerat damnatus, &c. Concil. Sinu-
Again: *Episcopus Quirinus dixit, Infudisti cor tuum, ponti-* Concil. Sinu-
fex, malitia, &c. Vulnerasti universa membra tua. Again: *Te non condemnamus, præsul: quoniam ex ore tuo justifi-* Concil. Sinu-
caberis, et ex ore tuo condemnaberis: Marcellinus in con- Concil. Sinu-
spectu synodi cecidit in terram. Ibi ergo jacentem eum, et Concil. Sinu-
moram facientem, damnaverunt. Again: *Subscripserunt* Concil. Sinu-
igitur in ejus damnationem, et damnaverunt eum extra civi- Concil. Sinu-
tatem. Again: *Sacerdos Helchiades subscripsit primus in* Concil. Sinu-
ejus damnationem, non tantum pro hoc tempore, sed etiam in Concil. Sinu-
exemplum futuri temporis. And again: *Diocletianus im-* Concil. Sinu-
perator audivit, quod trecenti episcopi in eandem damna- Concil. Sinu-
tionem convenissent. Now say you, "What have you won

²⁸ [Richard Anal. Concill. i. 185. said to have been held A. D. 303, says that the Acts of this council, are now admitted to be spurious.]

by this example?" Thus much verily, M. Harding: first, that the successor of Peter may be an idolater, for so was Marcellinus. Secondly, that the same Marcellinus was judged by the council of Sinuessa: wherein also you may find yourself guilty of great untruth, unless ye will say, so many grave fathers condemned the pope openly without judgment. ☞

That pope Sylvester II. was a conjurer, and gave himself whole body and soul unto the devil, and by the devil's procurement was made pope: that pope Zosimus, for ambition and claim of government, corrupted the holy council of Nice.

M. Harding,
fol. 249 a & b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "You say it: but never *Addition.*

did any honest man say it from the beginning of the world. You shew yourself to be a man of ill disposition. No man ever said it but Illyricus or bawdy Bale. You maintain the succession of [lies in] your generation." *The answer.* This is M. Harding's ordinary eloquence, good reader, therefore let it not offend thee. For the truth of this matter, I refer thee to the council of Africa, whereat were present St. Augustine, Alypius, and two hundred and fifteen other bishops. The discourse is long. Shortly to open it, thus it standeth. Zosimus²⁹ the bishop of Rome claimed a sovereignty in judgment and jurisdiction over all Africa. The bishops there withstood him, and said he had no such right to deal among them. Zosimus, for proof of his claim, alleged a canon of the council of Nice, touching the universal authority of the pope. They answered, they had likewise the council of Nice, but in all the same could find no such canon. Alypius the bishop of Tagasta, speaking hereof, saith thus: "This thing moveth me much, that when we laid together and examined the originals of the Nicene council, written in Greek, these things (concerning

Concil. Afric.
101—105.
[Mansi iv.
511—516.]

Concil. Car-
thag. 6. cap
4. [iv. 404.]

²⁹ [According to Richard Anal. Concil., pope Zosimus had, by writing, quoted two canons of the council of Sardica, viz. the 5th and the 14th, instead of those of Nice; this occurred A. D. 418; the legates of his successor Bonifacius repeated the error after his

death A. D. 419: and then it was agreed to have recourse to the copies of the Nicene canons preserved in the east; by which means the forgery was detected in the popedom of Cælestinus A. D. 422. Supra vol. ii. 163, note 4.]

the superiority of the pope) we found not there. But how it cometh to pass, I cannot tell." The pope sheweth forth one copy of the council: they shewed forth another. They were not so suppliant or simple to think the pope's copy was undoubtedly true, and therefore to yield unto him without further search. They imagined, that either he sought to deceive them, or was deceived himself. In conclusion, they agreed, that either party should send into the east, to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antiochia, for a copy of the same council, taken out of the very originals that remained among them, that thereby it might appear, whether their copy were falsified, or the pope's. Hereunto Atticus the bishop of Constantinople, and Cyrillus the bishop of Alexandria, returned their answers. Their epistles are extant to be seen until this day, as well in Greek as in Latin. By this certificate it was evident to all men, that the pope's copy disagreed from all the rest, and was corrupted: but by whom, and to what purpose, a babe may easily understand. All other copies were true: the pope's only copy was false. If this be not falsifying and corruption, M. Harding, give it any other name that may like you better. And withal I beseech you to consider, whether of these two things in your own judgment seemeth more likely, either that the pope, to maintain his estate and authority, should falsify one copy, or else that all the bishops of Africa, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Græcia, without cause or hope of any manner gain, should falsify all the copies through the world. Verily the one is not unlikely: the other almost impossible.

In Concil.
Afric. cap.
102, 103. in
Græco, p. 82.
[Mansi iv.
511—516.]

But you say: "That pope Zosimus corrupted the Nicene council, never did any honest man say it from the beginning of the world. No man ever said it, but Illyricus or bawdy Bale." Yes, M. Harding, there were some that said it before either Illyricus or Bale was born. And that M. Cope, one of your pew-fellows, could have told you. For thus he saith, although disdainfully and in scornful meaning: *Certe doctissimi quique ex omni Græcia, et inter eos Bessarion, cum Florentino concilio interessent.....*

Copus Dial.
1. p. 78.

jactabant Nicenum canonem per Romanos pontifices depravatam.....: “Verily the best learned men of all Græcia, and among them Bessarion, being present at the council of Florence, make crakes, that the canon of the Nicene council was corrupted by the bishops of Rome.” Indeed these words they spake, and spake them with modesty as might become them: as for their crakes and brags, I remember none.

Thus there said Marcus the archbishop of Ephesus in the name of all the rest: *Nonne vides, reverende pater, summum pontificem (Zosimum) falsum decretum, et non in synodo promulgatum ad tantum concilium, pro re tam magna misisse?* “And see you not, right reverend father, that pope Zosimus being the highest bishop, for a matter of so great weight, sent unto that worthy council of Africa a false, or a falsified decree, such as never was published in the council of Nice?” Again he saith: *Nullam equidem de Zosimo fecissem mentionem, reverende pater, nisi meum de eo sermonem verum esse possem ostendere*: “I would not have spoken one word of pope Zosimus, reverend father, unless I had been able to prove my tale to be true³⁰.” They that gave consent hereunto, and avouched the same, and at that time sat present in the council, were Josephus the patriarch of Constantinople, Bessarion the archbishop of Nice, and afterward bishop of Tusculum and cardinal of Rome, Isidorus the metropolitan of Syria, besides seventeen³¹ other archbishops and metropolitans, with a great number of other inferior bishops and learned fathers that attended upon them.

It were very hard for you, M. Harding, to say, that all these were dishonest men, or of ill disposition, or the maintainers of the succession of lies. They lived in the light and commendation of the world above an hundred and forty years ago, long before either Flacius Illyricus or John Bale was heard of. They said openly in the council

Concil. Floren, sess. 20.
[Mansi xxxi.
773 d. e.]

In ead. sess.
[ibid., 783,
784.]

³⁰ [“Hoc volo dicere, nos hoc testimonium non attulisse, non quod proferre aut non habeamus aut non valeamus, possumus enim nullo id facere negotio,” (ἔχομεν γὰρ καὶ ῥαδίως παραγαγεῖν.) Bishop Jewel follows Crabbe.]

³¹ [In the fol. ed. of 1609, this number is erroneously altered to seventy.]

of Florence : "That pope Zosimus had falsified the council of Nice : and further said they were able to prove it, and that otherwise they would not have said it." Mark therefore, M. Harding, the truth and courtesy of your words. Thus you say : "Never did any honest man thus say from the beginning of the world." ➡

That pope Liberius was an Arian heretic.

Addition. ➡ M. Harding. "Or else you are an errant M. Harding, 249 b. slanderous liar....How seemeth not this wicked generation to spring of the devil, seeing it maketh the worst of every thing, speaking ill of that which may well and ought charitably to be defended? And yet, if he had been an Arian with all his heart, so long as he never decreed any thing according to the Arian heresy, nor did set it forth by public authority of the see of Rome, that should not hurt our matter of succession." *The answer.* Whoso is able to allege the allowed authority of good writers, and imagineth nothing of himself, M. Harding, is neither a slanderer nor a liar. First yourself have granted, that pope Liberius subscribed and gave his hand unto the Arian heretics. Wherein it may reasonably be thought, that the Arians believed he gave also the inward agreement of his heart, and therefore embraced him as one of their own. Further, Rhegino saith in plain wise : *Liberius reversus ab exilio* [Rhegino lib. 1. [anno 295.] *revocatus*] *hæreticis favet* : "Pope Liberius, after he returned from out of banishment, bare good will to the heretics."

Alphonsus de Castro saith : *De Liberio papa constat* [Alphons. lib. 1. cap. 4. [p. 20.] *Platina refert*]³² *fuisse Arianum* : "Touching pope Liberius, it is well known he was an Arian." Sabellicus saith : *Ariani precibus suis apud Constantium Liberio reditum ad urbem confecere. Quo ille beneficio commotus, ex confesso Arianus, ut quidam scribunt, est factus* : "The Arian heretics, by their entreaty unto the emperor Constantius, obtained of him that pope Liberius might be restored again unto the city. With which good turn Liberius being moved, as some have written, became an Arian heretic" (*ex confesso*) "in good earnest, and with his heart." Platina

³² [The ed. of 1539, printed by Canesinus, Colon. (in the British Museum) reads "constat;" in later and expurgated edd. this appears to have been altered into "Platina refert."]

Platina in
Liberio.

saith : *Liberius imperatoris beneficio motus, ut quidam volunt, in rebus omnibus sensit cum hæreticis, &c. Pontifex tametsi cum Arianis sentiebat, tamen ecclesias Dei diligenter exornabat, &c.* : “Pope Liberius, moved with the emperor’s gentleness, as some think, agreed in all things with the heretics.” Mark well these words, M. Harding. “He agreed,” saith he, “in all things with the heretics.” And again : “Pope Liberius, notwithstanding he were of one judgment with the Arians, yet he diligently furnished the churches of God.” In an old *Pontificale* written in vellum, you may find this whole matter recorded thus : *Imperator Liberium, qui sibi et Arianis consenserat, in sede reposuit : et sic infelix Liberius basilicam S. Petri vi tenuit septem annos : et tum facta est magna persecutio in urbe, ita ut clerici Liberio contradicentes, martyrio coronarentur* : “The emperor Constantius, being an Arian heretic, restored pope Liberius to his see, for that he agreed with him and with the Arians. And thus wicked Liberius held Peter’s church seven years by violence. Then was there raised a great persecution in the city of Rome, so that the priests there, for withstanding Liberius the pope, were crowned with martyrdom.” Nicolaus Cusanus saith : *Liberius, et Honorius, et alii in cathedra Petri aliquando insedentes, in errorem schismaticum seducti ceciderunt : sedes tamen absque vitio remansit* : “Pope Liberius, and pope Honorius, and other popes sitting for a while in Peter’s chair, being misled, fell into schismatical error : yet Peter’s chair remained still without fault.” Again afterward he saith : *Liberius consensit errori Arianorum* : “Pope Liberius gave his consent to the error of the Arians :” and for proof thereof he allegeth St. Hierom in *Chronicis*. Anselmus Rid saith : *Liberius primus a pontificum Romanorum integritate recessit* : “Pope Liberius was the first, that forsook the pure doctrine of the bishops of Rome.”

Nicol. Cusa.
de Concord-
antia, lib. 1.
cap. 14. [p.
707.]

Nicol. Cusa.
de Concord-
antia, lib. 2.
cap. 5. [p.
716.]

Anselmus
Rid.

By these we may see that pope Liberius fell into the schismatical error of the Arians : that he subscribed and gave his name and hand unto the Arians : that he favoured the Arians : that he consented unto the Arians : that it is certainly known he was an Arian : that in good earnest, and with his heart, he became an Arian : and that in all

matters and points of doctrine he was of one mind and judgment with the Arians. If all these writers were errant liars and slanderers, as you say, M. Harding, why then are they not so published to the world? I reckon ye will not say, that they were all Lutherans.

But touching that pope Liberius was a favourer of the Arian heretics, I have said further, The author hereof is St. Hierom: *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis in Fortunatiano*³³.

And one of M. Harding's own principal doctors saith: *De Liberio papa constat fuisse Arianum*. Hereunto, M. Harding,

you have answered thus: "Here have we two new untruths added to the old. St. Hierom, in the place by M. Jewel alleged, saith not that pope Liberius was a

favourer of the Arians." *The answer*. Then, M. Harding, may it like you to hear Cardinalis Cusanus, what he can tell you. I trust you will not discredit him with so many untruths. He was a cardinal of the church of Rome. His

words be these, as you have heard before: *Rediit Liberius ab exilio victus, et consensit errori, ut scribit S. Hieronymus in Chronicis*: "Pope Liberius returned from banishment,

and yielded and consented unto the error" (of the Arians),

"as St. Hierom writeth in Chronicis." If yielding and

consenting be not sufficient, Rhegino saith further: "He favoured the heretics." Sabellicus saith: "As some have

written, he became an Arian in good earnest." Platina

saith: "By the report of some, he agreed in all things

with the heretics." But hereof we have sufficiently spoken before.

Further ye say: "But who is that one of M. Harding's principal doctors that saith these words: *De Liberio constat fuisse Arianum*?" what is the cause, that here M. Jewel

nameth him not? is he grown more shamefaced than heretofore,

that he would be loath to be found a notorious liar? Well,

though he were ashamed to be taken with a lie, yet was he not

ashamed to make a lie. This principal doctor of mine is Alphonsus de Castro. How may this be known?

Forsooth, even by M. Jewel himself, who in his pretended

³³ [The words are these "... "ad subscriptionem hæreseos com-
"pro fide ad exilium pergentem "pultit." Harding relies much
"primus sollicitavit ac fregit, et upon the compulsion."]

[Hieron. de
Eccl. Script.
97. tom. iv.
pt. 2. p. 124.]

M. Harding,
fol. 62 a.

Nicol. Cusa.
de Concord-
antia, lib. 2.
cap. 5. [p.
716.]

Favet Hæret.

Ex confesso.

In rebus
omnibus
consensit
cum hæreti-
cis.

M. Harding,
fol. 63.

Defence writeth thus, where, without all error, ye may be sure he bringeth much matter to shew that the pope doth err. Certainly Alphonsus saith, &c. And where saith Alphonsus thus? Marry, saith M. Jewel, in his marginal quotation. *Alphonsus contra Hæreses, lib. 1. cap. 4.* But read that chapter who will, verily in the books of sundry prints that I have seen, he saith it not. If it were once so printed, and afterward by the author revoked, it ought not to be alleged." *The answer.* "But who" (say you) "is that one of M. Harding's principal doctors?" Ye wis, M. Harding, ye are not ignorant who it is. All your game is spilt in vain. No man was ready to spare you the laughter. Alphonsus it is: and Alphonsus de Castro, in his book intituled *De Hæresibus*, printed at Paris by Jodocus Badius, in folio, anno 1534³⁴. If it have been otherwise altered sithence, we may easily imagine who were the doers. Certainly thus saith Alphonsus: *Omnis homo errare potest in fide, etiamsi papa sit. Nam de Liberio papa constat fuisse Arianum: et Anastasium papam fuisse Nestorianis, qui historias legerit, non dubitat. Quod autem alii dicunt, eum, qui erraverit in fide obstinate, jam non esse papam, ac per hoc affirmant, papam non posse esse hæreticum, est in re seria verbis velle joculari. Non enim dubitamus, an hæreticum esse, et papam esse in unum coire possint: sed id quærimus, an hominem, qui alias in fide errare potuisset, dignitas pontificalis efficiat in [l. a] fide indeviabilem. Non enim credo, aliquem esse adeo impudentem papæ assentatorem, ut ei tribuere hoc velit, ut nec errare, nec in interpretatione sacrarum scripturarum hallucinari possit. Nam cum constet plures eorum adeo esse illiteratos, ut grammaticam penitus ignorent, qui fit, ut sacras literas interpretari possint?* "Every man may err in the faith, yea, although it be the pope. For as touching pope Libe-

Lib. 1. cap. 4.

Yea although
it be the
pope.

³⁴ [This edition of the works of Alphonsus is in All Souls' library, and contains the whole passage as Jewel quotes it. The words after "dubitat" are not found in the editions of 1556. Antw. 1565. Antw. and 1571. Paris; they appear to have been expunged in the editions subsequent to that of

1539. See the Reply, ante vol. ii. p. 211, note 42. See also Laud's Conference with Fisher, (p. 263, 264. ed. 1637,) where however the archbishop asserts, that the passage had been mutilated in the edition of 1539, apparently the same which bishop Jewel mentions below as containing the whole.]

rius, it is certain that he was an Arian heretic. Neither can It is certain. any man doubt, that hath read the stories, but pope Anastasius was a favourer of the Nestorians. But whereas some say, that he that erreth wilfully in the faith is now no longer pope, and therefore say the pope cannot be an heretic, they seem in a sad matter to dally with words. For we make no doubts, whether the pope and an heretic We make no doubt. may agree in one person : but this is our question, Whether a man, that otherwise might have erred in the faith, by virtue of the papal dignity, be made such as cannot err. For I do not believe, that there is any so impudent a So impudent a flatterer. flatterer of the pope, that will give him this preeminence, that he can neither be deceived nor miss in the expounding of the scriptures. For seeing it is well known, that many popes be so utterly void of learning, that they know Popes know not their grammar rules. not the principles of their grammar, how may it be, that they should be able to expound the scriptures?"

Thus saith my Alphonsus, M. Harding, printed at Paris five and thirty years ago. In like sort, and with the very same words, was the same book afterward printed at Colain by Arnold Birckman, *anno* 1539³⁵. What other new books Alphons. Colonise ann. 1539. or new spectacles you have gotten you, I cannot imagine. Even to like purpose writeth Nicolaus Cusanus, a cardinal of Rome : *Judicium fidei non est semper in nutu unius pontificis definibile : quia hæreticus esse potest* : " The Nicol. Cusan. de Concordantia, lib. 1. cap. 15. [p. 708.] judgment of faith is not always to be determined by the beck of the pope alone : for the pope may possibly be an heretic." 

That pope Leo, as appeareth by the Legend, was likewise an Arian.

Addition. *Addition.*  M. Harding. "As it appeareth by the Legend. What an obscure proof is this ! Forsooth there is an old motheaten book, wherein saints' lives are said to be contained, &c. It shall not greatly skill, who was the author of it. Certain it is, that among some true stories there be many vain fables written. Among which is one," &c. *The answer.* This book was not so much motheaten,

³⁵ [In the Brit. Museum there is an edition of 1539, printed at Cologne by Melchior Canesinus, which contains the passage unmutilated.]

nor so far out of credit, M. Harding, as you tell us. It was read sadly unto the people, and had in reverence, when the holy scriptures of God were motheaten and thrown into corners: and it was called *Aurea Legenda*, as you know, “the golden Legend,” for the excellency that it seemed to have above all other stories. Thus were you able in your kingdom of darkness to give the people dross, and to call it gold: and to lead them into the clouds and shadows of death, and yet to make them believe they walked in the light.

As for this matter of pope Leo, I report it not as a certain truth, as it might appear unto you by my words. I leave the credit thereof to the author. If it be a fable, it is your own: it is not ours. Thus much at the least we may reasonably gather hereof: although pope Leo were no Arian, yet, notwithstanding his popedom, and the ‘succession’ of Peter, by this author’s judgment, he might well have been an Arian. ➞

That pope Cœlestinus was a Nestorian heretic.

[Harding’s
Detect. 253
b.]

Addition. ➞ M. Harding. “Who ever heard such an *Addition.* impudent man? It was Cœlestinus which condemned Nestorius, &c. A most impudent liar: a wicked slanderer.”

The answer. These outcries full well become you, M. Harding. Bestow your shame upon him that hath best deserved it. “Pope Cœlestinus,” you say, “condemned Nestorius and all his heresies.” So did pope Liberius, as it is said before, condemn the Arians: and yet afterward himself became an Arian. This is a case that often happeneth, and may be proved by sundry examples. You yourself, M. Harding, have preached mightily and terribly against the Roman religion, as you may remember: and yet sithence, ye know, ye are become a defender and patron of the same. This matter that so much grieveth you, touching pope Cœlestinus, is recorded by Laurentius Valla, no Lutheran, I trow, but a great learned man, and a canon of the church of Rome. His words be these: *Neque aliquem sua dignitas ab increpationibus tutum reddit, quæ Petrum non reddidit: multosque alios eodem præditos gradu, ut Marcellum, quod diis libasset, ut Cœlestinum, quod cum Nestorio hæretico sentiret: “No man’s dignity*

Laur. Valla
de Donatone
Constantini.
[p. 16.]

may defend him from controlment," (if he offend,) "for Peter was not so defended, nor many others that were advanced to the same degree: as pope Marcellus" (or rather pope Marcellinus) "for that he had offered up sacrifice unto idols: and as pope Cœlestinus, for that he agreed with the heretic Nestorius." Here you find plainly by express words, M. Harding, that pope Cœlestinus was a Nestorian heretic. Now if you be so much ashamed hereof, return the shame to Rome again hardly, from whence it came: either to Laurentius Valla, that sent it hither: or to the pope himself, that best deserved it. ➞

Pope Cœlestinus a Nestorian heretic.

That pope Honorius was a Monothelite heretic.

Addition.

Addition. ➞ M. Harding. "Now at length, M. Jewel, you say that, which hath some face of truth. For Honorius indeed fell into the heresy of the Monothelites: but he fell into it, when as yet it was not evidently condemned by the church in any general council, &c. It standeth well together, that pope Honorius, albeit in his own person he favoured that heresy, yet durst not to publish it in common assembly: but contrariwise did there, as they gave him counsel. Whereby it came to pass, that he both deposed the Monothelites openly, and yet favoured their opinion privily. And this is the only pope, who may justly be burdened with heresy." *The answer.* Here is a proper defence, and a proper pope. Openly abroad he condemneth them as heretics, whom privily in his heart he alloweth and liketh as catholics. "This only pope," you say, "may be justly charged with heresy. For indeed he fell into the heresy of the Monothelites." All this is your own confession, M. Harding: and yet whereas I say the same pope Honorius was a Monothelite heretic, you tell me, "that this tale hath some face of truth." "Some face," you say, and no more. For truth itself ye dare not allow me, be it never so true. ➞

Justly charged. Indeed.

That pope John XXII. was reproved by Gerson and the school of Paris for an heretic³⁶: Petrarcha saith: "Rome

³⁶ [Gerson. serm. 5. in Festo Paschali. "Propter quod apparet falsitas doctrinæ papæ Johannis 22, quæ damnata fuit cum sono buccinarum vel tubarum coram

"rege Philippo, avunculo tuo, per theologos Parisienses," &c. Harding, in his Answer to the view of untruths, endeavours to explain this away.]

Nicol. Lyra
in Matt. cap.
16. [v. 280.]

is a sanctuary of all heresies." Lyra saith: "That many popes have fallen into heresies."

M. Harding.
fol. 256.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "He saith, many, as well *Addition.*

princes as chief priests, have fallen from the faith: but not that many have decreed heresies, as to be followed. But I find not those many, nor yet M. Jewel himself, as diligent as he is about it." *The answer.* I marvel not, M. Harding, though ye find not these 'many.' For ye seek, as a man that would not find them. I have already reckoned seven popes that were heretics. Ye may add thereunto pope Anastasius II. an Arian heretic. If all these may not be counted 'many' in the see of Rome, ye may at your pleasure call them 'few.' The law saith:

Fulgus de
inuitatis
moris gene-
ribus. [lib. 9.]

10. quest. 3.
Unio.

Decem faciunt populum: "Ten men are enow to make a people." Much more eight men are enow to make 'many.' Verily I know not any one see in all Europe, wherein you can lightly find so 'many' heretics as we have found sitting in Peter's chair. Nicolaus Lyra saith: "'Many' popes have fallen from the faith." But you make small account of his authority. Add therefore to him the council of

Concil. Basil.
in Epist.
Synodali.
[xxix. 246 c.]

Basil. There shall you find the selfsame words: *Multi pontifices in errores et hæreses lapsi esse leguntur*: "We read that many popes have fallen into errors and heresies." Add also Æneas Sylvius, being afterward a pope himself.

Æneas Sylv.
de Gestis.
Concil. Basil.
lib. 1. [p.
9. a.]

Thus he saith: *De Romanis pontificibus liceret exempla admodum multa adferre, si tempus sineret: quoniam aut hæretici, aut aliis imbuti vitiis sunt reperti*: "Of the popes of Rome we might shew forth very many examples, if time would suffer it, that they have been found either heretics, or else defiled with other vices." Thus you have by the witness both of a pope and of a council, that 'many,' and 'very many,' popes have been heretics. ☞

Very many.

You know, that pope Hilbebrand, as he was charged by the council of Brixia, was an advouterer, a church-robber, a perjured man, a man-killer, a sorcerer, and a renegade of the faith.

M. Harding,
256 b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "I know, that you lie: I *Addition.* may say it, saving my charity, rather than your worship.

For pope Gregory the Seventh was a very holy man, &c.

M. Harding,
257 a.

If you were but a civil honest man, M. Jewel, you would

not take that for a truth, which one enemy saith of another. By perusing of Marianus Scotus, Platina, Lambertus Scaphnaburgensis [l. Aschaffenburgensis], and Naclerus, you shall find yourself a liar, and pope Hildebrand a virtuous man." *The answer.* No doubt, M. Harding, a holy and a virtuous man, and very much like unto the apostles of Christ: but wherein, I believe, ye cannot readily tell us: unless it were for that he was proud and stately above all measure, and suffered the emperor Henry the Fourth to wait upon him in Italy before the gates of Canossus, without his imperial robes, in the winter season, in hard frost and extreme cold, with bare legs and bare feet, three days together, before he would once admit him to his presence. Thus, I trow, Peter and Paul but seldom did.

"Beno," you say, "was his enemy, and wrote of displeasure, and therefore his words weigh the less³⁷." So may I say, Marianus Scotus was his friend, and wrote of favour, and therefore his words likewise weigh the less. Indeed Beno, that lived with him, and best knew him, saith thus: That Hildebrand, being as yet but a cardinal, smote pope Alexander with his fist, and laid him in prison: that he poisoned six popes his predecessors, to make himself way to the popedom: that he was a conjurer, and a raiser of devils, and that in his fury he threw the sacrament into the fire. But, lest only Beno should bear all the blame, a great number of catholic bishops in Italy, at the council of Brixia, called Hildebrand, then being pope, "a false monk:" "an usurper of the see of Rome:" "not appointed by God, but intruded by fraud and money:" "a disturber of the empire:" "a subverter of the church³⁸." Howbeit, you say: "All these bishops conspired together against our Lord, and against his vicar."

Anselmus Rid saith: "That pope Hildebrand by his means had made the leaden sword of the pope's authority so mighty, that it had utterly dulled and defaced the iron sword of the empire: and that, in the time of his popedom, both the ecclesiastical and the temporal jurisdiction was shaken and broken with infinite miseries."

³⁷ [See vol. iii. p. 35, note 26.]

³⁸ [See the Preface to the Reader, vol. iv. 116.]

Sabel. En-
nead. 9. lib. 3.
Blondus
Decad. 2.
lib. 3.

Beno.

Urspergen.
ann. 1080.

M. Harding,
257 a.

Anselmus
Rid.

Sigibert.
Gemblacensis, ann.
1074. [leg.
1077.]

Sigibertus Gemblacensis saith : " Pope Hildebrand troubled the states of Christendom, raised up the Saxons against their liege prince, discharged the subjects from their oath of fidelity, caused Rodolphus the duke of Burgundy to proclaim himself emperor, and sent him a crown imperial with this posy :

PETRA DEDIT PETRO : PETRUS DIADEMA RODOLPHO.

Sigibertus,
ann. 1085.

In the end the citizens of Rome expelled him, and chased him out of the city : not for any his great virtue or holiness, I trow : for Rome is holy. By mean of the grief and agony hereof he fell into melancholy and deadly diseases, and, finding himself past all recovery, he called unto him one of his cardinals, whom he specially trusted, and confessed unto him that he had foully abused his pastoral office, and that he had troubled mankind with malice and mischief, by the procurement and counsel of the devil." And yet, M. Harding, must we believe you upon the credit of your word, that pope Hildebrand was so virtuous and so godly a man ? or is it a matter of such virtue and holiness to trouble the church of God with wars and murders, and to follow the counsel of the devil ? Though you may safely discredit others, yet may you not discredit the pope himself. This is the pope's own confession, devoutly uttered unto his ghostly father, immediately before his death. Though Beno were an enemy unto him, yet was he no enemy unto himself.

Se valde peccasse pastoralis cura, et suadente diabolo, contra humanum genus odium et iram concepit.

M. Harding,
257 a.

But you say : " Read Lambertus Scaphnaburgensis, Nauclerus, and others : and you shall find yourself to be a liar." What say they then, M. Harding ? Verily Lambertus saith thus : *Clerici clamant, Hildebrandum esse hominem plane hæreticum, et vesani dogmatis* : " The priests cry out against pope Hildebrand, and call him a plain heretic, and a man of wicked doctrine." You will say, Lambertus uttereth not this as his own judgment. I grant you that. Yet he uttereth it as the judgment of the clergy.

Lambertus
Scaphnaburg.

Naucler.
Gener. 36.
[leg. 37.]

In like sort also saith Nauclerus : " The clergy said that pope Hildebrand, for good causes, was excommunicate by all the bishops of Italy : that he had defiled the see apostolic with simony, heresy, murder, and advoutery : that he was an apostata, and had forsaken the faith of Christ."

And lest you should say, He uttereth these words as spoken by his enemies, and not as of himself: in the end he concludeth thus : *Quæ Hildebrandi tempore in republica Christiana sunt acta, hujusmodi fere sunt, ut scriptores dubitent an honestatis argumento et fidei zelo ab eo gesta sint* : “The things that were done in the time of pope Hildebrandus were such for the most part, that the writers doubt, whether they were done in consideration of honest order and zeal of faith, or rather otherwise.”

Nauclerus
Gener. 37.

You say : “He was zealously bent to correct such faults as were in the clergy at that time, specially simony.” Yea, M. Harding, but Sigibertus saith thus, speaking of pope Hildebrand³⁹ by name : *Notam avaritiæ honesto nomine prætexunt, dum hoc quod se gratis dare jactant, sub charitatis nomine vendunt : ut de Montanis dicit Eusebius, Sub nomine oblationis artificiosius munera accipiunt* : “They cover the shame of their covetousness with the cloak of an honest name : they sell things under the name of charity : and yet they boast they give them freely. So saith Eusebius of the heretics called Montanists, They take bribes cunningly and with better skill under the name of oblations.”

M. Harding,
257 a.

Sigibert.
Gemblac.
ann. 1074.

Now, M. Harding, I beseech you, judge uprightly : He that smiteth the pope violently with his fist, and with force and villainy imprisoneth his person, that is a false “monk,” a “poisoner,” a “conjurer,” a “burner of sacraments,” a “simonist,” an “usurper of the see,” a “disturber of the empire,” a “subverter of the church,” an “advancer of traitors,” a “raiser of rebels,” a “person justly excommunicate,” and an “heretic :” may he nevertheless be called a virtuous and a holy man ? is virtue and holiness so rife in Rome ?

Save your charity hardly, and what worship you list. Whatsoever ye presume to find in others, it is wisdom to see aforehand, what may be found worthily in yourself. ➞

That Platina calleth the popes sometimes in scorn, *pontificulos* : “little petite popes :” sometimes *monstra et portentosa* : “monsters and unnatural and ill shapen creatures.”

Platina in
Romano 1.

³⁹ [Sigebertus does not appear to attribute these practices to Gregory, but to describe them as the consequences of his measures. The passage is by no means clear.]

Petr. Parisien. in Speculo citatur ab Illyrico de Testibus. [No. 210.]

Pope Adrian the Fourth was wont to say : *SUCCEDIMUS NON PETRO IN PASCENDO, SED ROMULO IN PARRICIDIO* : “ WE SUCCEED NOT PETER IN FEEDING, BUT ROMULUS IN KILLING.” And to leave dame Joan the woman pope, with many others mo of like virtue and holiness, as having no pleasure in this rehearsal : and, forasmuch as M. Harding began this matter with Salisbury, to end it with the same : Johannes Sarisburiensis saith : *In Romana ecclesia sedent scribæ et Pharisei* : “ In the church of Rome” (by succession) “ sit the scribes and the Pharisees.”

Johan. Sarisburiensis in Polycratico. [lib. vi. c. 24.]

This is M. Harding’s holy ‘succession.’ Though faith fail, yet ‘succession’ must hold. For unto such ‘succession’ God hath bound the Holy Ghost. For lack of this ‘succession,’ for that in our sees in the churches of England we find not so many idolaters, necromancers, heretics, advouterers, church-robbers, perjured persons, man-killers, runagates, monsters, scribes and Pharisees, as we may easily find in the church of Rome : therefore, I trow, M. Harding saith, we have no ‘succession :’ we are no bishops : we have no church at all.

[Harding’s Detect. 264 b.]

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “ Are you not ashamed thus *Addition.* notoriously, and withal most slanderously, to bely that blessed ‘succession’ of the bishop of Rome ?” ☞

But St. Paul saith : “ Faith cometh” (not by ‘succession,’ but) “ by hearing : and hearing cometh” (not of legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop, but) “ of the word of God.” They are not always godly, that succeed the godly. Manasses succeeded Ezekias : and Hieroboam succeeded David. By ‘succession’ the Turk this day possesseth and holdeth the four great patriarchal sees of the church, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Hierusalem. By ‘succession,’ Christ saith : “ Desolation shall sit in the holy place :” and Antichrist shall press into the room of Christ.

Matt. xxiv. 15.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “ Doth Christ say, It shall *Addition.* be so by succession ? You falsify the words of God and man, and that verily by ‘succession.’ For so have all heretics your forefathers done before you. ‘Succession’ is the chief way for any Christian man to avoid Antichrist, &c. For Antichrist cometh not, except defection and

M. Harding, 266 b. 267 a.

apostasy go before." *The answer.* I would be loath, M. Harding, to falsify the words either of God or of man. Touching the 'succession' of place, whereof only we speak, Christ saith: "Desolation shall stand in the holy place." And St. Paul saith: "Antichrist shall sit in the place of Christ." The same place that received the one, shall receive the other. Otherwise, tell us, I pray you, M. Harding, in what other place shall he sit? or, why doth St. Paul say: "Antichrist shall sit in the temple of God?" or, why doth St. Augustine³³ and St. Chrysostom say: "Antichrist shall sit in the church of Christ?"

² Thess. ii. 4.
Augustin. de Antichristo, tom. 9. [iv. app. 243.]
Chrysost. in 2 Epist. ad Thess. hom. 3. [xl. 525.]

"Succession," you say, "is the chief way, for any Christian man to avoid Antichrist." I grant you, if you mean the 'succession' of doctrine. Therefore St. Paul saith: "In the latter days some shall depart from the faith." He saith not: 'They shall depart from their place, but "from their faith." And St. John saith: "If any man come unto you and bring not this doctrine, salute him not." He saith not: If he keep not his place, but, "If he bring not this doctrine." It is the doctrine, whereby Antichrist shall be known, and not his place. For, as I have said: "He shall sit in the place of Christ."

¹ Tim. iv. 1.
² John 10.

You say: "Antichrist shall not come, except a defection or departing go before." What defection, or what departing, M. Harding? Mean you a departing from the pope? Whatsoever you mean, verily St. Paul meaneth a departing from Christ. And so the old learned fathers have expounded it. In like sense St. Paul saith: "The time shall come, when they shall not bear wholesome doctrine. They shall stop their ears against the truth. They shall turn themselves to hear fables." And what if the pope himself be departed from Christ? Yet must we needs keep him company, and depart together? Verily, as I have elsewhere reported, the bishop of Bitonto doubted not openly to say in the late council of Trident:

M. Harding, 267 a.

² Tim. iv. 3.

[Supra iv. 218.]

Utinam non a Christo ad Antichristum, velut prorsus unanimes, declinassent: "Would God they were not gone from Christ to Antichrist, as it were with one consent." And

Concil. Trident. [Crabb. iii. 979.]

³³ [The work de Antichristo is not now considered genuine.]

Nicol. Lyra
in 2. ad Thess.
li. [Bibl. cum
Gloss. Ordin.
tom. vi. ed.
1508.]

thus he pronounceth of the pope, and of his clergy of the church of Rome. Nicolaus Lyra, above two hundred and fifty years ago, said thus: *Ab ecclesia Romana jam diu est, quod recessit gratia* [l. Græcia]³⁴: "It is long sithence the grace of God [l. Greece] is departed from the church of Rome." This, this, M. Harding, is the departing that St. Paul speaketh of. Not our departing from the pope, but the pope's departing from the grace of God. From which grace, whoso ever is departed, is departed from Christ.

Now, M. Harding, if the pope and his Roman clergy, by his own friends' confession, be fallen from God's grace, and departed from Christ to Antichrist, what a miserable claim is it for them to hold only by bare 'succession.' 

Bernard. in
Concil. Re-
men. [Mansi
xli. 469.]

Augustin.
contra Do-
nat. lib. 6.
[ix. 161.]
1 Quæst. 3.
vocantur
canes.

Irenæus, lib.
4. cap. 43.
[p. 262.]

Lib. 2. epist.
3. [ad Cæcil.
p. 109.]

It is not sufficient to claim 'succession' of place: it be-
hoveth us rather to have regard to the 'succession' of
doctrine. St. Bernard saith: *Quid prodest, si canonice
eligantur, et non canonice vivant?* "What availeth it, if
they be chosen in order, and live out of order³⁵?" So saith
St. Augustine: *Ipsium characterem multi, et lupi, et lupis
imprimunt*: "The outward mark or right of a bishop many
give to wolves, and be wolves themselves." Therefore
the ancient father Irenæus giveth us this good counsel:
*Eis qui sunt in ecclesia presbyteris, obaudire oportet, qui
successionem habent ab apostolis,.....qui cum episcopatus
successione, charisma veritatis certum, secundum benepla-
citurum Patris acceperunt*: "It becometh us to obey those
priests in the church, which have their 'succession' from
the apostles: and together with the 'succession' of their
bishoprics, according to the good will of God the Father,
have received the 'undoubted gift of the truth.'" St. Cy-
prius, being likewise charged for dissenting from his pre-
decessors, answereth thus: *Si quis de antecessoribus meis* [l.
nostris]...*non hoc observavit, et tenuit, quod nos Dominus ex-
emplo, et magisterio suo docuit, potest simplicitati ejus venia*

³⁴ [Bp. Jewel has here com-
mitted a remarkable mistake.
The passage stands as follows:
"Propter quod alii exponunt de
"recessu ab obedientia ecclesiæ
"Romanæ; a qua jam diu est quod

recessit Græcia."]

³⁵ [Mansi states that the two
speeches attributed to St. Bernard
in Concil. Remensi are the com-
position of another author.]

concedi: nobis vero ignosci non potest, qui nunc a Domino admoniti et instructi sumus: "If any of my predecessors have not observed and kept the same, that our Lord hath taught us both by his example and also by his commandment, his simplicity may be pardoned: but we" (if we do the like) "can hope for no pardon, being now admonished and instructed of our Lord."

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "Cough up man. It will choke you, if you let it tarry within your throat. Here is but half the bone. There is yet in Cyprian no full point. It followeth in the same sentence: *Ut calicem Dominicum vino mixtum, secundum quod Dominus obtulit, offeramus:* 'That we should offer our Lord's cup mixt with wine, accordingly as our Lord offered the same,' &c. Do they offer our Lord's chalice at all? or, do they grant that our Lord in his supper offered it? do they mingle water with wine at the time of consecrating the mysteries? What folly, what madness," &c. *The answer.* There is no such danger of bones, M. Harding. The child shall do well enough by God's grace. "I make no mention," you say, "of offering our Lord's cup." I grant you. No more do I of many other things in the same epistle contained. What then? should I for your pleasure have alleged and translated the whole epistle? or, have you decreed it to be an heresy, if a man allege no more than is needful? or, have I reported any manner untruth? or, stand the words otherwise than I have reported them? In this place I had cause only to speak of 'succession:' but to speak of sacrifice, I had no cause. Howbeit, as you know, in five hundred other places, as time required, I have spoken also fully and largely of the sacrifice: and yet ye wiss without any great danger of choking. Such childish toys are meet for children.

St. Cyprian saith: "We offer our Lord's cup mixt with wine." But he saith not as you say: "We offer up the Son of God substantially and really unto his Father." Take away only that blasphemy wherewith you have deceived the world, and then talk of mingling the cup, and of the sacrifice, while ye list. St. Cyprian saith: "We

offer the Lord's cup," meaning thereby, the wine contained in the cup. So likewise St. Augustine saith :

Augustin. de
Fide ad Petr.
cap. 19. [vi.
app. 30.]

Ecclesia offert sacrificium panis et vini : "The church offereth up the sacrifice of bread and wine³⁶." If there be any darkness in this manner of speech, both St. Cyprian and St. Augustine have plainly expounded their own meaning. St. Cyprian, in the same epistle before alleged, saith thus :

Cyprian. lib.
2. epist. 3.
[p. 104—108.]

Calix in commemorationem Christi offertur :—vino Christi sanguis ostenditur : ideo vinum ponitur, ut Domini sanguis vino intelligatur :—aqua sola (sine vino) non potest exprimere sanguinem Christi :—in aqua populus intelligitur :—in vino ostenditur sanguis Christi :—passionis Christi memoriam in omnibus sacrificiis facimus :—passio Domini est sacrificium quod offerimus : "The cup is offered in remembrance of Christ : by the wine Christ's blood is shewed" (or signified) : "therefore wine is used, that by wine we may understand the Lord's blood : water only without wine cannot express the blood of Christ : in the water we understand the people : in the wine Christ's blood is represented : in all our sacrifices we work the memory of Christ's passion : the sacrifice that we offer, is the passion of our Lord." Thus much St. Cyprian in the same epistle.

Augustin. de
Fide ad Petr.
cap. 19. [iv.
app. 30.]

St. Augustine saith : *In hoc sacrificio est gratiarum actio, et commemoratio carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulit, et sanguinis ejus, quem pro nobis effudit* : "In this sacrifice is a thanksgiving and a remembrance of the flesh of Christ, that he hath offered for us, and of the blood of Christ that he shed for us³⁶." Thus saith St. Cyprian : thus saith St. Augustine : thus say the old godly learned fathers of the church of Christ. These are no bones, M. Harding : they are the food of everlasting life. ➡

Compare the use and order of our churches, M. Harding, with the primitive church of God, and ye shall easily see the right of our 'succession.' St. Cyprian saith : *Si canalis aquæ, quæ copiose prius et largiter proflebat, subito deficiat, nonne ad fontem pergitur, &c. ? Hoc et nunc facere oportet Dei sacerdotes præcepta divina servantes, ut in aliquo*

Cyprian. ad
Pompeium
contra Epist.
Stephani.
[p. 141.]

³⁶ [This work is by Fulgentius Ruspensis, fl. A. D. 507.]

si nutaverit et vacillaverit veritas, ad originem Dominicam, et evangelicam atque apostolicam traditionem revertamur: et inde surgat actus nostri ratio, unde et ordo, et origo surrexit: “If the pipes of the conduit, which before ran with abundance, happen to fail, do we not use to search to the head? &c. The priests of God keeping God’s commandments must do the same: that if the truth have fainted or failed in any point, ‘we return to the very original of our Lord, and to the tradition of the gospel, and of the apostles:’ that therehence we may take the discretion of our doings, from whence the order itself and original first began.”

Addition.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “It is to be known, M. Harding, p. 271 b. M. Jewel, that St. Cyprian used that saying in an evil case. And therefore, he, defending a falsehood, was driven to the very same shifts, whereunto all heretics are driven.” *The answer.* Whatsoever were St. Cyprian’s case, verily M. Harding hath devised but a poor defence for himself. For, alas, what a simple shift is this, to say that so holy a father and martyr of Christ was driven to use the shifts of all heretics! Grant we, that St. Cyprian stood in some error. Yet let us see what were his heretical shifts. Thus he saith: “If the truth faint or fail in any point, we ought to return to the original of our Lord, and to the tradition of the gospel,” &c. And is this the shift of all heretics, to submit themselves and their causes to the trial of God’s truth? or doth no man use this kind of shift, but only heretics? Wherefore then doth Christ so often use the same? wherefore doth Christ say: “From the beginning Matt. xix. 8. it was not thus:” “It is written in the scriptures: Search John v. 39. & vil. 52. the scriptures?” wherefore doth the prophet Esay say: “Resort to the law, and to the testimony of our Lord?” wherefore doth Tertullian say: *Peræque ad* [*l. adversus*] Tertull. advers. Prax. p. 316. [cap. 2. p. 501.] *universas hæreses jam hinc præjudicatum est, id esse verum, quodcunque primum: id esse adulterum, quodcunque posterius?* “By this rule we may equally prescribe against all heretics: That is true, that was first appointed: that is false, that was afterward devised?” It were hard to say, that Christ, his apostles, the prophets, and holy fathers, were shifters and heretics.

Yet notwithstanding, M. Harding saith: "We may not be led by St. Cyprian's rule. It is a shift and a practice of heretics." This therefore must be his rule: "Although the truth faint or fail in any point, yet may we not return to the original of our Lord, nor to the tradition of the gospel." St. Cyprian saith: *Non debemus [leg. oportet] hominis consuetudinem sequi, sed veritatem Dei*: "We may not follow the custom of man, but the truth of God." Nay, saith M. Harding: "This is the shift of all heretics." We may not follow the truth of God, but the custom of man. St. Cyprian saith: *Relicto errore, sequamur veritatem*: "Forsaking error, let us follow the truth." Nay, saith M. Harding: "So do heretics: this is but a shift. We must leave the truth, and follow error." If you will needs shift off, and so miserably gloss St. Cyprian's sayings, M. Harding, thus verily must you say: And indeed this rule hath of long time been canonized in the church of Rome, and accounted catholic. But such are they of whom Christ saith: "Ye have broken the commandments of God, to maintain your own traditions." 

Cyprian. lib.
2. epist. 3.
[p. 108.]

Cyprian. ad
Pompeium
contra epist.
Stephani.
[p. 141.]

Matt. xv. 3.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 1.

Moreover we say, that Christ hath given to his ^[Vol. iv. p. 18.] ministers power to bind, to loose, to open, to shut.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The difference that is between us and our adversaries in this whole matter is not great: saving that it liketh well M. Harding to busy himself with needless quarrels without cause. Three kinds of confession are expressed unto us in the scriptures. The first made secretly unto God alone: the second openly before the whole congregation: the third privately unto our brother. Of the two former kinds there is no question. Touching the third, if it be discreetly used, to the greater comfort and better satisfaction of the penitent, without superstition or other ill, it is not in any wise by us reprov'd. The abuses and errors set apart, we do no more mislike a "private confession," than a "private sermon."

Thus much only we say, that “private confession” to be made unto the minister, is neither commanded by Christ, nor necessary to salvation. And therefore Chrysostom saith: *Non dico tibi, ut te produs in publicum, neque ut te accuses apud alios. Sed obedire te volo prophetæ dicenti, Revela Domino viam tuam:* I will thee not to bewray thyself openly, nor to accuse thyself before others: but I counsel thee to obey the prophet, saying, Open thy way unto the Lord³⁶.”

Chrysostom.
ad Hebræos,
hom. 31. [xii.
289.]

Addition.

Addition.  M. Harding. “St. Chrysostom in this place speaketh not indeed of sacramental confession, but of that which is daily to be made to God alone, &c. But in other places he hath taught us, that.....unto our priests it is given utterly to cleanse, not the lepre of the body, but the filth of the soul,” &c. *The answer.* “St. Chrysostom,” you say, “in these words speaketh not of sacramental confession.” No great marvel, M. Harding. For, I believe, you cannot find that any ‘confession’ was known by that name in Chrysostom’s time. But in these words he speaketh of confession to be made unto others. Call it “sacramental,” or “private,” or “auricular,” or what you list. Of this kind of confession St. Chrysostom saith: “I will thee not to betray thyself openly, nor to accuse thyself before other.” Thus, I trow, he would not have said, had he thought this kind of confession to be necessary.

M. Harding,
fol. 274 b.

M. Harding,
fol. 275 a.

But you say: “St. Chrysostom saith, Our priests have power utterly to cleanse the filth of the soul.” And who saith otherwise? When we consecrate priests, we pronounce Christ’s words over them: “Whose sins you do forgive, they are forgiven.” But are sins forgiven only by private confession? If so, how happened it then that there was no “private confession” used in the church of Constantinople during the whole time that St. Chrysostom was bishop there?

Sozomen.
[leg. fors.
Socrat.]
lib. 5. cap.
19.

³⁶ [Chrysost. ad Hebr. οὐ λέγω σοι ἐκπόμευσον παντὸν, οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις κατηγορήσον, ἀλλὰ πειθέσθαι συμβουλευώ τῷ προφῆτῃ λέγοντι, ἀποκάλυψον πρὸς Κύριον τὴν ὁδόν σου. ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ταῦτα ὁμολόγησον, ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαστοῦ ὁμολόγει τὰ ἁμαρτήματα εὐχόμενος, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῇ γλώττῃ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μνήμῃ.]

Notwithstanding, good Christian reader, that thou mayest understand the truth of M. Harding's dealing, in that whole place of Chrysostom, there is no mention at all of any confession, either "private," or "public," or "sacramental," or "auricular," or any other. Read the place. If thou find it otherwise, I will yield. You will say: "He speaketh of forgiveness of sins." I know it well: yet not of confession. He speaketh of the sacrament of baptism: of preaching and of prayer. By these means St. Chrysostom saith, the priest remitteth sins, and reconcileth God unto the people. Who would think that M. Harding would allege those places for "private confession," whereas is not so much as one word once spoken of "confession?"

Chrysostom.
de Sacerdo.
lib. 3. [l.
384.]

M. Harding,
fol. 275 b.
[S. Basil in
Quest.
compend.
288. tom. II.
p. 516.]

M. Harding. "Against your heretical proposition I will set St. Basil's catholic judgment. Thus he saith: 'It is necessary to confess sins unto them, to whom the dispensation of the mysteries is committed. For so they, that in old time did penance, are found to have done before the saints. For it is written in the gospel, that they confessed their sins to John Baptist: in the Acts, that they confessed them to the apostles.' By St. Basil it is necessary to confess sins unto the priests. By M. Jewel it is not necessary at all. Who is the likelier of these two to be a liar?" *The answer.* O M. Harding, why do you thus abuse your simple reader? My words are these, as they lie plainly before you: "That 'private confession' be made unto the minister, it is neither commanded by Christ, nor necessary to salvation." To reprove this heretical proposition, for so it pleaseth you to call it, you have brought in the catholic judgment of St. Basil. But, I beseech you, among all these words of St. Basil, is there any one word of "private confession?" If there be any, let it appear. If there be none, why do you allege it? Mark the words and examples that St. Basil useth. "Thus," saith he, "the people confessed their sins to John Baptist: thus they confessed their sins to the apostles." Thus saith St. Basil. But did either the apostles, or John Baptist, hear "private confessions?" did they sit down upon a stool in a corner, and hearken what each man should

severally say unto them? No, no, M. Harding, St. Basil spake only of public offences, that were known to many. Such offences it was necessary for the satisfaction of the church to be confessed unto the priest, as unto the common minister of the whole, not secretly, or in a corner, but openly, and in the hearing of all the people. This confession, M. Jewel saith, is still necessary in the church of God. Now therefore yourself may judge, to use your own courteous words: "Whether of us is likelier to be the liar?" ➞

And Gratian, having thoroughly disputed and debated the whole matter of both sides, in the end leaveth it thus at large: *Cui harum sententiarum potius adhærendum sit, lectoris iudicio reservatur: utraque enim fautores habet sapientes et religiosos viros*: "Whether of these two opinions it were better to follow, it is left to the discretion of the reader: for either side is favoured, both by wise and also by godly men." Therefore the Gloss there concludeth thus: *Melius dicitur confessionem institutam fuisse a quadam universalis ecclesiæ traditione potius, quam ex Novi, vel Veteris Testamenti autoritate*: "It is better to say, that confession was ordained by some tradition of the universal church, than by the authority of the New or Old Testament." Likewise saith Theodorus, sometime archbishop of Canterbury, a Greek born: *Quidam Deo solummodo confiteri debere peccata dicunt, ut Græci*: "Some say we are bound to confess our sins 'only to God,' as do the Grecians." Whereupon the Gloss noteth thus: *Apud Græcos confessio non est necessaria: quia non emanavit ad illos traditio talis*: "Among the Grecians confession is not necessary, for that no such tradition ever came amongst them."

De Pœnit.
dist. 5. Quam-
vis pleni-
tudo.

De Pœnit.
dist. 5. In
Pœnit. in
Glossa.

De Pœnit.
dist. 1. Qui-
dam.

De Pœnit.
dist. 5. In
Pœnitentia.

But what need many words? M. Harding himself in the discourse hereof is forced to confess, that "the express term of 'auricular' or 'secret confession,' is seldom mentioned in the ancient fathers." His tale had been truer if he had said thus, The express term of 'auricular' or 'secret confession,' is never mentioned in the ancient fathers. Now to pass over certain other M. Harding's unnecessary talks, he groweth to the matter in this sort:

M. Harding,
[Confut.]
fol. 71 a.

M. HARDING.

Concerning the ministers of the church, we say, that they open and shut by dispensing the sacraments, who have their virtue of the merits of Christ. For whereas the sacraments have issued and flowed out of the side of our Saviour Christ, sleeping on the cross, (as by allusion we may use the words of the old figure,) wherewith the church is builded, therefore in the sacraments of the church the efficacy of the passion remaineth. And for that cause to the ministers also of the church, who be dispensers of the sacraments, a certain power is given to remove the bar that excludeth us from God's favour, not through their own, but through God's virtue and power, and merit of Christ's passion. And this power is called by a metaphor, "the key of the church," ^{The key of the church.} which key is key of the ministry : whereof we shall speak hereafter. This power, so much as concerneth release of sins, is exercised in the sacrament of penance, to the benefit of them that after baptism be relapsed and fallen into sin again. Of which power no Christian man doubteth, unless he hold the heresy of the Novatians, who were condemned for heretics by the church, because ^{For whom serveth the sacrament of penance.} they denied that priests in the church had authority to remit sins, ^{Novatians denied penance.} and so denied the sacrament of penance.

a This savoureth of untruth. For Novatus denied not private, but open penance.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

That duly receiving the holy sacraments ordained by Christ, we receive also the remission of sins, it is not any way denied. For the substance of all sacraments is the word of God, which St. Paul calleth *verbum reconciliationis* : "the word of atonement." This word is the instrument of remission of sin. The sacraments are the seals affixed to the same : the priest is the mean. St. Augustine saith : *In aqua Verbum mundat. Detrahe Verbum : quid est aqua nisi aqua ?* "In the water is the Word of God, that maketh clean. Take the Word away, and what is water else, but water?" Hereof we shall have cause to say more hereafter.

Augustin. in Johan. tract. 80. [iii. pt. 2. 703.]

All that is here brought in touching Novatus, it is utterly from the purpose. For Novatus never denied, but a sinner might confess his sins, either secretly to God alone, or publicly and openly before the whole congregation. As for auricular confession to the priest, for ought that may appear, he never heard of it. But herein stood his whole error, that he thought, whosoever had committed any great notorious sin after baptism, notwithstanding any submission or satisfaction he was able to make, yet might he never be reconciled unto his brethren,

or be received again into the church: not that he would hereby drive the penitent sorrowful sinner to despair of God's mercy, but (as some learned men have thought) only for example and terror unto others. And therefore Beatus Rhenanus saith³⁷: *In hac sententia veterum permulti fuerunt, (et in iis etiam Augustinus.)*

B. Rhenanus
in Argumento
libelli Tert.
de Pœnitent.
Augustinus,
epist. 54.
[cap. 3. tom.
ii. p. 526.]

St. Augustine saith: *Caute, salubriterque provisum est, ut locus illius humillimæ pœnitentiæ semel in ecclesia concedatur: ne medicina vilis minus utilis esset ægrotis*: "It hath been discreetly and wholesomely provided, that it should not be granted to any man to do that most humble open penance but only once in the church, and never more afterward: lest the medicine, being made over common, should not be profitable to the sick."

Thus much difference therefore we see there was between the church and Novatus. The church granteth the open sinner one only time of open reconciliation, and never more: but Novatus granteth none at all. Therefore the whole matter of Novatus might have served M. Harding to some other purpose. For confession, whether it were "private" or "public," was no part of his error.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 2.

And (we say) that the office of loosing consisteth in this point: that the minister either by the preaching of the gospel offereth the merits of Christ, and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent themselves, pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins, and hope of everlasting salvation: or else that the same minister, when any have offended their brothers' minds with some great offence, or notable and open crime, whereby they have as it were banished and made themselves strangers from the common fellowship, and from the body of Christ, then, after perfect amendment of such persons, doth reconcile them, and bring them

³⁷ [The words between brackets were not added by B. Rhenanus.]

home again, and restore them to the company and unity of the faithful.

M. HARDING.

The sum of all these gay words abridged, doth attribute loosing or absolution first to preaching, next to assoiling such as be excommunicate. As touching the first, these defenders confound the offices of preaching and of absolution. The preacher teacheth the hearers, and reporteth the words of Christ, as out of the mouth of Christ, saying: "Thus saith Christ," &c. The priest, which is the minister of absolution, according to the authority given to him by Christ, in his own person assoileth the penitent, saying: "a I assoile thee in the name of the Father," &c. b The preacher, in that he preacheth only, doth not assoile sinners, neither giveth he the merits of Christ, nor full pardon, by pronouncing unto them the gospel. c For if this great benefit consist in pronouncing or denouncing of the gospel, then why might not every layman, yea woman, yea young boys and girls, assoile sinners? yea why might not every man assoile himself? And would ye, sirs, appoint unto us such for judges constituted by Christ?.....

For the words of Christ be so plain, as they cannot be so violently wrested. For Christ said not, "To whom ye offer by preaching of the gospel my merits and pardon, or whose sins ye pronounce by the gospel to be remitted," but *quorumcumque remiseritis*, "whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them." For as the Son of man remitted sins to him that was sick of the palsy, and to Mary Magdalene, "that ye may know," saith he, "that the Son of man hath power to remit sins," &c., "even so he hath transferred d the same power unto priests," saith Chrysostom: which priests he hath sent, as the Father sent him. And if absolution consist in pronouncing of the gospel, which profiteth so much as it is believed, e then the power of the keys, which Christ hath given to the church, consisteth not so much in the minister as in the sinner that heareth and believeth, and so is forgiven, by Luther's opinion. And by this means the priest hath no special power. But we say with the church, that a sacrament hath his efficacy of the institution of Christ in him to whom it is adhibited..... In this sense the catholic church of Christ hath ever taught, that God worketh our salvation by sacraments, and in this faith it hath always baptized infants, that their sins being remitted, they might be made the children of God. f Likewise by the keys of the church, it hath assoiled persons bereft of the use of speech and reason, as the learned and ancient holy father Leo teacheth in his epistle *ad Theodorum Episcopum Foro-Juliensem* [i. 606.], and St. Augustine *de Adulterinis Conjugiis*, lib. 1. cap. 26. et ultimo.

Finally, if the office of loosing, that is, absolution, consisteth in preaching the gospel, and offering the merits of Christ by

a Untruth.
For Christ
never gave
the priest
any such
commission.

b Untruth.
For St. Hierom saith:
Solunt sermones Dei, et testimonii scripturarum.

c Untruth:
by M. Harding's own doctrine.
Read the answer.

d The same power, because they have the same word, and not otherwise.
e Untruth joined with vain folly.

f Untruth.
For the church assoiled not madmen: but only pronounced them to be assoiled before, when they were sober.

Johan. 20.
lib. 3. de
Dignitate
Sacerdotum.
[i. 383.]

[Aug istin.
tom. vi. 403.]

pronouncing the words in which the remission of our sins is expressed, as this defender teacheth : then had not the catechumens of old time, neither now should they be in any danger, if they should die without baptism and the grace of reconciliation, that is, not being assoiled. For they lacked no preaching, as now they lack not where any such be. The contrary whereof the church hath ever taught, and for witness of the same, besides other fathers, we have the plain doctrine of St. Augustine, who saith, " That a catechumen, how much soever he profiteth, beareth still the burthen of his iniquity, so long as he is not baptized³⁸."...

I deny not but cases of just necessity be excepted in the one and the other, having right and firm wills, and desire in each case : " when not the contempt of religion, but the point of necessity excludeth the mystery of baptism," as St. Augustine saith. Then how dangerous and pernicious is the doctrine of these defenders, our new ministering prelates, who, more with sweet and holy words than with truth, teach Christian people, that the office of loosing consisteth in offering by preaching of the gospel (as they call it) the merits of Christ and full pardon, and by pronouncing (I know not how) a sure and undoubted forgiveness of sins, and hope of everlasting salvation to such, forsooth, as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent them ! The contrition of heart they seem to speak of sufficeth not for loosing of sins, unless it be contrition formed with charity, as the divines teach. Which charity seeketh and requireth the sacrament of penance and the grace of reconciliation, which cannot be ministered but by a priest. Neither is it possible the priest to judge truly, who are lowly and contrite of heart, and repent them unfeignedly, forasmuch as he cannot search the heart, unless the penitents humble themselves unto him, and declare their repentance by simple and lowly confession of their sins. Which confession these new gospellers have abandoned out of their congregations. How much is more the catholic and wholesome doctrine of ^h St. Augustine to be embraced and followed, which he uttereth in these words : " Do ye penance, such as is done in the church, that the church may pray for you. Let no man say to himself, ' I do penance secretly, before God I do it : God who forgiveth me knoweth that I do it in my heart.' " But what saith St. Augustine hereunto ? " Why then," saith he, " it was said in vain, ' What things ye loose in earth, they shall be loosed in heaven.' Then without cause the keys be given to the church. We make void the gospel of God : we make frustrate the words of Christ.".....

St. Augustine saith : " Do ye penance," not such as liketh yourselves, not such as newfangled self-pleasing preachers teach you,

³⁸ [Harding here adds other testimonies from St. Augustine, and a penitent without absolute shew " what danger it is a Catechumen to die without baptism, and a penitent without absolute shew " what danger it is a Cate-

Tract. in
Johan. 13.
[iii. pt. 2.
394.]

Lib. 50. Homiliarum,
hom. 49. [v.
1504.]

Matt. xviii.

O dangerous doctrine !

g Untruth.
Read the answer.

h Manifest untruth. For St. Augustine speaketh these words of ' open confession' before the people.

but "such as is done in the church," which consisteth in contrition of heart, confession of mouth, and satisfaction of work, that so ye may be assoiled, and perfectly reconciled.....

Touching the second point,...we do not attribute the loosing of such as be excommunicate to the offering of Christ's merits and pronouncing of the gospel unto them, as you do, but to the power of jurisdiction by Christ given to the church³⁹.....

By the fathers excommunication, in consideration of the necessity of it, is called *nervus ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ*: "the sinew of churchly discipline:" by the canons, *mucro episcopi*: "the sword of a bishop:" by St. Augustine, *episcopalis judicii damnatio, qua pena nulla in ecclesia major est*: "the condemnation of a man by bishoply judgment, than the which there is no greater punishment in the church."

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We commit the keys of the kingdom of heaven only unto the priest, and to none other: and to him only we say, "Whatsoever thou bindest in earth, shall be bound in heaven." Yet nevertheless hath not every priest the use of these keys. Peter Lombard himself saith: *Sane dici potest, quod alteram istarum clavium, id est, scientiam discernendi, non habent omnes sacerdotes*: "We may safely say that all priests have not the one of these two keys: I mean the knowledge to discern." If they have not the keys, then can they neither open nor shut.

Neither doth it follow of our doctrine, that either children or laymen do, or may, forgive sins. And yet God's word may be mighty, be the pronouncer of it never so simple. St. Augustine saith: *Cum Christus Petro diceret, Tibi dabo claves regni cælorum,.....universam significabat ecclesiam*: "When Christ said unto Peter, Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, he signified thereby the whole church." And again: *Quæcunque ligaveris super terram, erunt ligata in cælo. Cœpisti habere fratrem tuum tanquam publicanum: ligas illum in terra. Cum autem correxeris, et concordaveris cum fratre tuo, solvisti illum in terra. Cum solveris in terra, solutus erit*

Sent. 4. dist.
19.

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
124. [iii. pt.
2. 822.]

Augustin. de
Verb. Dom.
Secund.
Matt. serm.
16. [v. 442.]

³⁹ [Harding finds fault with this expression in the Apology "that offenders have banished themselves," as though they had departed of their own accord, whereas they are excommunicated by the power of the keys.]

in cælo: “Whatsoever things thou shalt bind in earth, they shall be bound in heaven. Thou” (being a layman) “hast begun to have thy brother as a publican: thou bindest him in earth. But when thou hast corrected him, and hast agreed with thy brother, thou hast loosed him in earth. And when thou hast loosed him in earth, he shall be loosed in heaven.”

Likewise Theophylact saith: *Si tu offensus habes eum, qui te affecit injuria, sicut publicanum et gentilem, erit ille et in cælo talis: si autem solveris eum, hoc est, si illi condonaveris, erit illi et in cælo condonatum. Non enim solum quæ solvunt sacerdotes, sunt soluta: sed quæcunque et nos, injuria affecti, vel ligamus, vel solvimus, et ipsa erunt ligata, vel soluta*: “If thou, being offended, have him that hath done thee wrong as a publican and as an heathen, such shall he be also in heaven. But if thou loose him, that is to say, if thou pardon him, he shall be pardoned also in heaven. For not only the things that priests loose are loosed, but also whatsoever we” (being laymen), “having taken wrong, do bind or loose, the same things shall also be bound or loosed⁴⁰.”

This doctrine may not seem so strange to M. Harding, unless he be a stranger amongst his own. For by the order of his own church of Rome, an old wife, or a young girl, may minister the sacrament of baptism. And I trow he will not say, they may minister baptism without remission of sins.

In this church of Rome the power of the keys is lapped up oftentimes in a bull of lead, and sent abroad into the world by a lay-pardoner: and is thought nevertheless good and sufficient unto the receiver for remission of sins, notwithstanding the messenger be no priest.

Some of the late doctors of his said church have taught us, that a man may make his confession by a bill of his hand, and receive absolution by a trushman, or by a broker. Peter Lombard the grand master of their whole

De Pœnit.
dist. 1. Quem
pœnitet.

⁴⁰ [Theophyl. οὐ γὰρ μόνον ὅσα δεσμοῦμεν ἢ λύομεν, κακείνα ἔσται λύουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς εἰσὶ λελυμένα, δεδεμένα ἢ λελυμένα.] ἀλλ' ὅσα καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀδικηθέντες ἢ

Scotus 4.
Sent. dist. 17.
artic. 3.

school saith : *Si tamen defuerit sacerdos, proximo, vel socio est facienda confessio* : “ If thou want a priest, thou must make thy confession unto thy neighbour, or unto thy fellow.” And Beda saith, as he is alleged by the said Peter Lombard : *Coæqualibus quotidiana et levia : graviora vero sacerdoti pandamus* : “ Let us open our small and daily sins unto our fellows, and the greater unto the priest.”

Sent. 4. dist.
17. Nunc
priusquam.
Sent. 4. Ea-
dem dist.

Extra De
offi. judicis
ordinar. Pas-
toralis, in
Glossa.

And to be short, upon the Decretals it is noted thus : *In necessitate, laicus potest et audire confessiones et absolvere* : “ In case of necessity, a layman may both hear confessions and absolve.”

This is the order and doctrine of M. Harding’s own church. His own doctors tell him, that laymen and women may absolve the penitent, and forgive sins. Therefore he hath the less cause to dislike it.

M. Harding saith further : “ Christ saith not, ‘ To whom ye offer by preaching of the gospel my merits and pardon :’ or ‘ whose sins ye pronounce by the gospel to be remitted :’ but *quorumcunque remiseritis* : ‘ whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted.” If M. Harding will conclude of this negative, *ergo*, “ sins be not forgiven by the preaching of the gospel,” I trow it will be but a simple argument. For

Chrysostom.
in Matt. in
Opere imper-
fect. cap. 44.
[vi. app. 186.]

Chrysostom saith : *Clavicularii sunt sacerdotes, quibus creditum est verbum docendi et interpretandi scripturas* : “ The key-bearers be the priests, to whom is committed the word of teaching and expounding the scriptures.” And St. Hieron saith : *Quæcunque solveritis super terram, erunt soluta et in cælo. Solvunt autem eos apostoli sermone Dei, et testimoniis scripturarum, et exhortatione virtutum* : “ Whatsoever things ye loose upon earth, they shall be loosed also in heaven. But the apostles loose them by the word of God, and by the testimonies of the scriptures, and by exhortation unto virtue.”

Hieron. in
Esai. lib. 6.
cap. 14. [iii.
160.]

Hieron saith : *Quæcunque solveritis super terram, erunt soluta et in cælo. Solvunt autem eos apostoli sermone Dei, et testimoniis scripturarum, et exhortatione virtutum* : “ Whatsoever things ye loose upon earth, they shall be loosed also in heaven. But the apostles loose them by the word of God, and by the testimonies of the scriptures, and by exhortation unto virtue.”

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
80. [iii. pt. 2.
703.]

Likewise St. Augustine saith : *Jam vos mundi estis propter verbum quod loquutus sum vobis. Quare non ait, Mundi estis propter baptismum quo loti estis ? Nisi quia et in aqua verbum mundat* : “ Now are you clean because of the word that I have spoken to you. Why saith he not,

You are clean because of the baptism wherewith ye are washed? Saving that even in the water it is the word that maketh clean." Likewise St. Ambrose: *Remittuntur* Ambros. de Cain et Abel. cap. 4. [lib. ii. tom. 1. p. 212.] *peccata per verbum Dei, cujus Levites est interpres*: "Sins be forgiven by the word of God, the expounder whereof is the Levite or priest."

All the power is in the word of God, which St. Paul calleth: "The power of God unto salvation;" and *verbum* Rom. i. 16. *reconciliationis*: "The word whereby we be reconciled" 2 Cor. v. 19. unto God."

And for this cause Chrysostom saith, as it is alleged by Chrysost. de Sacerd. lib. 3. [l. 383.] M. Harding, that the priest hath the same power that Christ had, for that he preacheth the same word of God that Christ preached. And in this sense Christ saith unto his disciples: "As my living Father sent me, even so" John xx. 21. (and with like commission) "do I send you."

Otherwise the power of Christ far surmounteth and passeth all creatures: not only in earth, but also in heaven. Christ himself thereof saith thus: "All things are delivered" Matt. xl. 27. to me of my Father." And the prophet Esay saith: *Ponam* Isa. xxii. 22. *clavem domus David super humerum ejus. Aperiet, et nemo claudet: claudet, et nemo aperiet*: "I will set the key of the house of David upon his shoulder. He shall open, and no man shall shut: he shall shut, and no man shall open."

Of this doctrine, saith M. Harding, followeth a great inconvenience. "For then," saith he, "the power of the keys consisteth not so much in the minister, as in the sinner that heareth and believeth." This inconvenience is nothing so great as it is pretended. The error hereof standeth in the equivocation or doubtful taking of one word. For one thing may be in another sundry ways: as remission of sins may be in the priest, as in the messenger: in the word of God, as in the instrument: in the penitent party, as in the receiver. The offering hereof is in the minister: but the effect and force is in the sinner. Therefore St. Luke saith: "God opened the heart of the silk-Acts xvi. 14. woman, that she should give ear unto the words that were spoken by St. Paul." And Christ saith: "Whosoever" Mark xvi. 16.

4. Sentent.
dist. 18. Sed
queritur.

Clemens in
Parænetico.
[1. 10.]

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
39. [iii. pt. 2.
561.]

Augustin. in
Psaln. ci.
[iv. 1103.]

shall believe and be baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be damned." Likewise Peter Lombard himself saith: *Ex his aperte ostenditur, quod Deus ipse pœnitentem solvit, quando intus illuminat inspirando veram cordis contritionem*: "Hereby it plainly appeareth, that God himself looseth the penitent, when, by giving him inward light, he inspireth into him the true contrition of the heart." And therefore Clemens Alexandrinus saith: *Fides nostra est clavis regni cœlorum*: "Our faith is the key of the kingdom of heaven⁴¹." And St. Augustine likewise saith: *Cor clausum habent, quia clavem fidei non habent*: "They have their hearts shut, because they lack the key of faith." Again he saith: *Suscitari mortuus, nisi intus clamante Domino, non potest*: "The dead man cannot be raised again, unless the Lord cry within him."

1. Quæst. 1.
Dictum est.

And to come near to the purpose, Gratian himself saith: *Voluntas sacerdotis nec prodesse, nec obesse potest, sed meritum benedictionem poscentis*: "The will of the priest can neither further nor hinder, but the merit of him that desireth absolution."

Extra de
Baptismo, et
ejus effectu.
Majores
Ecclesie. §.
Item quæ-
ritur.

Augustin.
contra Juli-
an. lib. 6.
cap. 5.

Augustin.
Confession.
lib. 4. cap. 4.
[1. 99.]

Touching the objection of frantic persons and madmen, in what sort and how far absolution taketh place in them, forasmuch as it is an extraordinary case, I think it neither needful nor easy to define. Indeed a question is moved by pope Innocentius the Third, Whether, and in what sort, a man, either in his madness or in his sleep, may be baptized. And St. Augustine seemeth to witness that children sometime were baptized in their mother's womb⁴². Likewise he writeth of a friend of his own: *Cum jaceret sine sensu in dolore [leg. sudore] letali, et desperaretur, baptizatus est nesciens*: "Whereas he lay in a trance, without sense, in deadly pain, and was despaired of, he was baptized, and knew not of it."

Bonaventur.
In 4. Senten-
dist. 18.
quæst. 6.

Bonaventura added some force unto the matter, and demandeth this question: *An aliquis possit absolvi invitus*: "Whether a man may be absolved against his will or no?"

But concerning the absolution of madmen in the time of

⁴¹ [Clem. Alex. λογικαὶ γὰρ αἱ τοῦ Λόγου πύλαι, πιστεύας ἀνοίγνυμενα κλειδί. κ. τ. λ.]

⁴² [There is some mistake in this reference to St. August. contr. Julian.]

their phrensy, it seemeth this was both the meaning of Leo, and the godly discretion of the church at that time, that if a man, standing excommunicate, had happened to be bereft of his senses, and being in that case, had been likely to depart this life, upon proof of his former repentance, he should be restored, that he might depart in peace, as a member of the church of God. The practice hereof we may find in the council of Carthage by these words :

Si is qui pœnitentiam in infirmitate petit,.....in phrenesim versus fuerit, dent testimonium qui eum audiverunt, et accipiat pœnitentiam : “ If he that desired reconciliation by penance in his sickness afterward fall mad, let them that heard him bear witness with him, and so let him receive penance ⁴³.”

Concil. Carthaginen. 4. can. 76. [iii. 957.]

This was only a public testimony unto the church, that the party excommunicate was repentant before, when his mind was quiet. And what thing else M. Harding can gather hereof, I cannot tell. Certainly in this order and manner they restored not only madmen, but also dead men unto the church. For it is noted upon the Decrees : *Ex quo, cum per eum non stabat, ei communicare debemus. Et ita est absolvendus post mortem :* “ Wherefore, seeing there was no lack in his part, we ought to communicate with him. And so he must be absolved after his death.”

24. quæst. 2. de Comm. in Gloss.

The words that St. Augustine often useth unto beginners or enterers of the faith, called *catechumeni*, are uttered rather for terror of others than for rigour of truth, as shall appear. For otherwheres he writeth thus : *Catechumeni secundum quendam modum per signum Christi.....sanctificantur :* “ The *catechumeni* or beginners, after their sort, are sanctified by the sign of Christ.” Again he saith to them : *Nondum.....renati estis, sed per crucis signum in utero sanctæ matris ecclesiæ jam concepti estis :* “ Ye are not yet born anew, but by the sign of the cross ye are already conceived in the womb of the holy church your mother ⁴⁴.”

Augustin. de Peccator. Meritis, et Remissione, lib. 2. cap. 26. [x. 62.]

Augustin. ad Catechumen. lib. 2. cap. 1. [vi. 555.]

⁴³ [The Decrees of this council are sometimes called “statuta ecclesiæ antiqua.” The canon in question will be found in Bruns,

vol. i. p. 148.]

⁴⁴ [The Bened. Editors, though they do not venture to throw this work ad Catechumen. (a con-

Therefore having thus once entered into the faith of Christ, although they happened afterward to depart this life without baptism, yet the church oftentimes thought it good to judge well of them. St. Ambrose doubted not, but the emperor Valentinian departed hence in God's favour: and yet was the same emperor but a beginner and a novice in the faith, and departed hence without baptism.

M. Harding saith further: "Unless the penitent make particular rehearsal of all his sins, the priest or minister can be no judge." Whereunto I add also further, Notwithstanding any rehearsal that may be made, yet can the priest never be but a doubtful judge. St. Augustine saith: *Quid ergo mihi est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas, quasi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos? Unde sciunt, cum a meipso de meipso audiunt, an verum dicam? Quandoquidem nemo scit hominum, quid agatur in homine, nisi spiritus hominis qui est in homine*: "What have I to do with men that they should hear my confessions, as if they were able to heal all my griefs? when they hear me speak of me self, how can they tell whether I do say the truth or no? For no man knoweth what is done in man, but the spirit of man that is in man."

Howbeit, hereof have grown many unnecessary and curious questions: What years, what months, what days, what hours, what manner, what order of penance should serve for every several sin. In resolution of which doubts stood the judgment of the priest. And therefore ^aCarolus Magnus in his laws straitly commandeth, that the priests should be skilful in the book of penance.

But as touching the judge of sins, St. Chrysostom saith: ^b*Ante Deum confitere peccata tua. Apud verum Judicem cum oratione delicta tua pronuntia*: "Confess thy sins before God. Before the 'true Judge' with prayer pronounce thine offences⁴⁵." And again: *Cogitatione fiat*

tinuation of the Treatise de Symbolo) into the Appendix, yet declare their conviction that it was written by some author far inferior to St. Augustine. It had been hitherto considered genuine.]

⁴⁵ [Chrysost. ad Hebr. ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ταῦτα ὁμολόγησον, ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαστοῦ ὁμολόγει τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, εὐχόμενος, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῇ γλώττῃ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μνήμῃ. . . .]

Ambros. de obitu Valentinian. [lib. 1188.]

Augustin. Confess. lib. 10. cap. 3. [1171.]

^a Beat. Rhenan. in Tertull. de Pœnitent. Ut sacerdot. pœnitent. librum bene calleant.

^b Chrysost. ad Hebræ hom. 31. [xii. 289.]

delictorum exquisitio : sine teste sit hoc iudicium : solus te Deus confitentem videat : “ Let the examination of thy sins be wrought in thy heart : let this judgment be ‘ without witness :’ let God ‘ only’ hear thee, when thou makest thy confession.” And again he saith : *Medicinæ locus hic est, non iudicii : non pœnas, sed peccatorum remissionem tribuens : Deo soli dic peccatum tuum :* “ Here is place of medicine, and ‘ not of judgment :’ giving not punishment, but remission of sins. Open thy sin to God ‘ alone⁴¹.’ ”

And therefore in M. Harding’s own canons it is noted thus : *Confessio fit ad ostensionem pœnitentiæ, non ad impetrationem veniæ :* “ Confession is made” (unto the priest), “ not thereby to obtain forgiveness, but to declare our repentance.” And again : *Confessio sacerdoti offertur in signum veniæ acceptæ, non in causam remissionis accipiendæ :* “ Confession is made unto the priest in token of remission already obtained, and not as a cause whereby to procure remission.”

And yet is the priest a judge, all this notwithstanding : and pronounceth sentence as a judge, of doctrine, of open sin, of the offence of the church, and of the humility and heaviness of the penitent : and as a judge, together with the elders of the congregation, he hath authority, both to condemn and to absolve. Peter Lombard himself saith : *Etsi aliquis apud Deum sit solutus, non tamen in facie ecclesiæ solutus habetur, nisi per iudicium sacerdotis :* “ Albeit a man be absolved before God, yet is he not accounted absolved in the face of the church, but by the judgment of the priest.”

Likewise saith St. Augustine : *Hortor, prius publica pœnitentia satisfacere, et sacerdotis iudicio reconciliatum communioni sociari :* “ I exhort you, first to make satisfaction” (unto the church) “ by open penance, and so to be restored to the communion by the discretion of the priest⁴⁶.”

⁴⁶ [Chrysost. hom. 9. (*leg.* hom. 3.) de Pœnit. *ἱατρῆιον γὰρ ἔστιν ἐνταῦθα, οὐ δικαστήριον· οὐκ εὐθύνας ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπαιτοῦν, ἀλλὰ*

συγχώρησιν ἁμαρτημάτων παρέχον· Θεὸς μόνω εἰπὲ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν σου.]

⁴² [The book de Ecclesiast. Dogmat. is not by St. Augustine,

Chrysost. in Serm. de Confess. et Pœnitentia. [ed. Paris. 1558. tom. v. 771. ed. Savill. v. 512.] Chrysost. hom. 9. de Pœnit. [*leg.* hom. 3. tom. ii. 300 c.]

De Pœnitent. dist. 1. Omnis qui,

In eod. cap.

4. Sent. dist. 18. Non autem.

Augustin. de Ecclesiast. dogmatib. lib. 1. cap. 53. [*al.* cap. 23. viii. app. 78.]

Cyprian. lib.
3. epist. 15.
[p. 20.]

Origen. in
Psalm. 37.
[ii. 686.]

Sozomen.
lib. 7. cap.
16. [ii. 300.]

The order hereof, as it is set forth by St. Cyprian, was this: First, the sinner by many outward gestures and tokens shewed himself to be penitent and sorrowful for his sin: after that he made humble confession thereof before the whole congregation, and desired his brethren to pray for him: lastly, the bishop and the clergy laid their hands over him, and so reconciled him. So saith Origen: *Qui lapsus est, procedit in medium, et exomologesin facit*: "He that hath offended, cometh forth into the midst" (of the people), "and maketh his confession." Sozomenus likewise, describing the same order, saith thus: *Rei ad terram sese pronos abjiciunt cum planctu et lamentatione: episcopus ex adverso occurrit cum lachrymis, et ipse ad pavementum lamentando provolvitur: et universa ecclesiæ multitudo lachrymis suffunditur*: "They that have offended fall down flat with weeping and lamentation to the ground: the bishop cometh to him with tears, and himself likewise falleth down: and the whole multitude of the church is poured over and over with tears."

I use the mo words herein, for that the whole matter is long sithence grown utterly out of use. Notwithstanding, this is the confession and penance, that St. Augustine speaketh of. Of open confession, M. Harding, he saith: "The keys were not given to the church in vain." Of open confession he saith: "Whatsoever ye loose in earth shall be loosed in heaven." Of open confession he speaketh all these words, and not of any auricular or private dealing. If M. Harding happen to doubt hereof, let him look better upon his books. There shall he find, even in the very same place he hath alleged, these words, partly going before, partly following: *Agite pœnitentiam, qualis agitur in ecclesia, ut oret pro vobis ecclesia:.....Job dicit, Si erubui in conspectu populi confiteri peccata mea,..... Propterea Deus voluit ut Theodosius ageret pœnitentiam publicam in conspectu populi:.....Nolite permittere viros*

Augustin. in
lib. 50. Ho.
milliar. hom.
49. [v. 1504.]

but by Gennadius, either the bp. of Constantinople, fl. 458. See of Marseilles, fl. A. D. 495, or Cave and the Bened. ed.] according to some, the patriarch

vestros fornicari: interpellate contra eos ecclesiam: “Do penance, such as is done in the church, that the church may pray for you: Job saith, I was not ashamed ‘in the sight of all the people’ to confess my sins: therefore God would that Theodosius” (being the emperor of the world) “should do ‘open penance,’ even in the presence of all the people. Ye wives, suffer not your husbands to live in fornication: come before the ‘congregation,’ and cry against them.”

This is the confession that St. Augustine speaketh of: not secret, or private, or in the ear: but public, and open, and in the sight and hearing of all the people. In like manner saith St. Ambrose: *Multos necesse est ut ambias, et obsecres ut dignentur intervenire.....Fleat pro te mater ec-* Ambros. de Penitentia, lib. 2. cap. 10. [li. 435, 436.] *clesia, et culpam tuam lachrymis lavet*: “‘Thou must needs humble thyself, and desire many’ to entreat for thee. ‘Let the church, thy mother,’ weep for thee, and let her wash thy offence with her tears.”

This therefore, M. Harding, was no plaindealing, with such sleight to turn public into private, and the open audience of the whole people into one only man’s secret ear, and so much to abuse the simplicity of your reader. Certainly these words of St. Augustine: “open penance,” “confess openly,” “in the sight of all the people,” “that the whole church may pray for thee:” these words, I say, will not easily serve to prove your purpose for private confession.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 3.

We say also, that the minister doth execute the authority of binding and shutting, as often as he shutteth up the gate of the kingdom of heaven against unbelieving and stubborn persons, denouncing unto them God’s vengeance and everlasting punishment: or else, when he doth quite shut them out from the bosom of the church by open excommunication. Out of doubt, what sentence soever the minister of God shall give in this sort, God him-

self doth so well allow it, that whatsoever here in earth by their means is loosed and bound, God himself will loose and bind, and confirm the same in heaven.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth.
For we con-
found them
not.

Here again you confound ^athe power of binding and the office of preaching, as you did before, speaking of the power of loosing. Whereto we say, as we said before of that other, that binding and shutting consisteth not in denouncing of God's vengeance, but in the exercise of the key of jurisdiction committed to the church. The ministers whereof bind sinners, whom for just cause they loose not, but know that they are not to be loosed. And to that key pertaineth excommunication, and by the same it is exercised.

Untruths.
Five to-
gether, as
may further
appear by
the answer.

Whatsoever by them is thus loosed or bound in earth, God himself alloweth for loosed and bound in heaven. Such priests because ye, 1. have not in your new church, at least after this wise : 2. using priestly authority : 3. and none will suffer to be made : 4. nor such authority to be exercised : ye 5. defraud the faithful people of the great benefit of the sacrament of penance, keeping them fast bound to their sins after baptism committed. And so ye cause their everlasting damnation, for whom Christ hath shed his blood, the price of their redemption.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We confound not these keys, M. Harding, but speak plainly and distinctly of either other. We say that the power, as well of loosing as also of binding, standeth in God's word : and the exercise or execution of the same standeth either in preaching, or else in sentence of correction, and ecclesiastical discipline.

Of the latter hereof there is no question : of the former M. Harding pronounceth precisely, although, as it appeareth, not most advisedly : " Binding," saith he, " and shutting standeth not in denouncing of God's vengeance."

And hereof he certainly assureth us, as of a most undoubted verity. Howbeit, in so saying, he seemeth not to consider the power and weight of the word of God.

John xii. 47.

Christ himself saith : " If any man shall hear my words, and shall not believe, I condemn him not.....He that refuseth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that condemneth him. The word that I have spoken is it, that

shall judge him at the last day." Likewise saith St. Paul :
 " We are the good savour of Christ in them that be saved, ^{2 Cor. ii. 15.}
 and in them that perish. Unto them that perish, we are
 the savour of death unto death : in them that be saved, we
 are the savour of life unto life." And again : " If the ^{2 Cor. iv. 3.}
 gospel be hidden, it is hidden from them that perish." So
 saith God unto the prophet Ezekiel : " If thou give warn- ^{Ezekiel iii. 19.}
 ing to the wicked, and he will not be turned from his
 wickedness, he shall perish in the same : yet hast thou
 discharged thine own soul."

To be short, the whole scriptures are full hereof : and
 therefore St. Augustine saith : *Prædicatur evangelium qui-* <sup>Augustin.
epist. 49. ad
Deogratias.
[ii. 279.]</sup>
busdam ad præmium, quibusdam ad judicium : " The gospel
 is preached, to some unto reward, to some unto judgment."

For the rest, M. Harding saith : " Such priests because
 ye have not in your new church, at least after this wise
 using priestly authority, and none will suffer to be made,
 and such authority to be exercised, ye defraud the faithful
 people of the great benefit of the sacrament of penance,
 keeping them fast bound to their sins after baptism com-
 mitted : and so ye cause their everlasting damnation, for
 whom Christ hath shed his blood, the price of their re-
 demption."

These great words are not very well seasoned : they are
 big in sound, and small in weight : they are full of terror,
 and void of wit. For the church of England hath au-
 thority this day by God's word to bind and loose, as much
 as ever Christ gave any to his apostles : and by the same
 authority the same church of England is able to bind, not
 only M. Harding and his fellows, as Peter bound Simon
 Magus, or as Paul bound Elymas the false prophet ; but
 also the pope himself, if he be an open offender : and, as
 St. Paul saith, is able to deliver him over unto Satan : and
 undoubtedly being so bound in earth, he shall also stand
 bound in heaven.

Our people remain not bound, nor perish in their sins,
 as these men so uncharitably and fondly have imagined.
 They be so certain of the remission of their sins in the
 blood of Christ, as if Christ himself were present and

1 John 1. 7. spake it to them. They are taught and know, that “the blood of Christ the Son of God hath made us clean from all our sins:” and, “that there is no name under heaven whereby we shall be saved, but only the name of Jesus Christ.”

As for private confession, abuses and errors set apart, as it is said before, we condemn it not, but leave it at liberty. And therein we may seem to follow the advice of Charles the emperor in his late *Interim*: for thus he writeth: *Confessio et peccatorum enumeratio, ut non nimis laxanda est, ita vicissim non nimis est astringenda.*

Touching the priests of your making, M. Harding, of whom ye seem to make so great account, your own Peter Lombard saith of them, as it is said before: *Sane dici potest quod alteram clavem, id est, scientiam discernendi, multi [l. omnes] sacerdotes non habent.* And in like manner saith your own Bonaventura: *Omnes fere ita sunt simplices et idiotæ post susceptionem sacerdotii, sicut ante*: “All priests, for the most part, are as simple and unlearned after the receiving of orders as they were before.”

But be it granted, that your priest be fully furnished with all his keys: yet is it not he, that by any his authority forgiveth sins. Your own Gratian saith: *Evidentissime datur intelligi, quod sine confessione oris peccata possunt deleri*: “It is evidently given us to understand, ‘that without confession of mouth’ sins may be forgiven.” And again: *Ore tacente, veniam consequi possumus*: “‘Though we say nothing,’ yet we may have pardon.” Again: *Luce clarius constat, cordis contritione, non oris confessione peccata dimitti*: “It is apparent, and more clear than the light, that sins be forgiven by contrition of the heart, and ‘not by confession of the mouth.’” And again: *Dominus ostendit, quod non sacerdotali judicio, sed largitate divina [leg. divinæ gratiæ] peccator mundatur*: “Our Lord hath taught us, that the sinner is made clean, ‘not by the judgment of the priest,’ but by the mercy of God.”

Thus, M. Harding, it is plain by the judgment of your own doctors, that, were your auricular confession quite abolished, yet might the people notwithstanding have full

Interim
Caroli 5.
ann. 1548.

4. Sent. dist.
19. Post.

Bonavent. 4.
Sent. dist.
18. quæ. 1 E.

De Pœnit.
dist. 1. Quis
allquando.

De Pœnit.
dist. 1. Con-
vertimini.

remission of their sins. But of you it may be verified, that Christ said unto the Pharisees: "Ye have taken away Luke xi. 52. the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and neither do ye enter yourselves, nor will you suffer others that would enter." Of your keys Veselus said long sithence: *Claves papæ et prælatorum non aperiunt regnum Dei, sed claudunt potius*: "The pope's and the prelates' keys do not open the kingdom of God, but rather shut it." Veselus de subditis et superiorib.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis. 1.*

And touching the keys, wherewith they may either shut or open the kingdom of heaven, we with Chrysostom say: "They be the knowledge of the scriptures:" with Tertullian we say: "They be the interpretation of the law:" and with Eusebius we call them: "The word of God."

M. HARDING.

.....The let, whereby the whole nature of man is shut out of heaven by the sin of our first parent, is taken away by the passion of Christ. But because before that benefit be received, heaven yet remaineth shut, both for sin original contracted, and sin actual committed, we have need of the sacraments and keys of the church.

The holy fathers, for good considerations grounded upon scripture, have divided the keys into the key of order, and the key of jurisdiction: and either of them into the key of knowledge, which they call also the key of discretion, and into the key of power⁴⁷.....

To these defenders we say, that they confound the keys, and seem not to know what the keys are. Verily these be not only the knowledge of the scriptures, nor the interpretation of the law, nor the word of God, although these also do open or shut the kingdom of heaven in their kind, as Chrysostom, Tertullian, and Eusebius may well say: and not only these, but also mira-

⁴⁷ [Harding proceeds: "The key of order is the power of priestly vocation, function or ministry, which containeth power and authority to preach the gospel, to consecrate the body of Christ, to remit or to retain sins, to administer the sacraments. The key of jurisdiction is a spiritual power of coercion, given to this use, that people be kept from evil, and contained in all good exercises, that they may be worthy to be made partakers of the sacraments and of all spiritual good things."]

cles, and plagues, and all other things which prepare the will or understanding of man, whereby he may receive the benefit of those most principal keys that now we speak of.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Gentle reader, for the better understanding hereof, it may please thee to consider that the word of God, according to the sundry effects and properties thereof, hath sundry names. For example: for that it increaseth and multiplieth, it is called "seed:" for that it cutteth the heart, and divideth the flesh from the spirit, it is called a "sword:" for that it taketh and encloseth us, and bringeth us together, it is called a "net:" for that it washeth us clean, it is called "water:" for that it enflameth us, it is called "fire:" for that it feedeth us, it is called "bread:" and even so, for that it openeth and giveth us an entry into the house, it is called the "key." This house is the kingdom of heaven: Christ is the door: the word of God is the key.

For thus saying M. Harding telleth us: "We confound matters, and seem not to know what we say." Notwithstanding, herein we imagine nothing of our own, but only report the very words and sentences of the ancient learned catholic fathers.

Tertull. contra Marcion. lib. 4. [cap. 27. p. 444.]

Tertullian saith: *Quam clavem habebant legis doctores, nisi interpretationem legis?* "What key had the doctors of the law, saving the exposition of the law?" St. Hierom

Hieron. in Esa. [tom. iii. p. 148.]

saith: *Duces ecclesiæ habent claves scientiæ, ut aperiant scripturas creditis sibi populis. Unde præcipitur, ut magistri aperiant, et discipuli ingrediantur:* "The captains of the church have the keys of knowledge, to open the scriptures unto the people to them committed. Therefore commandment is given, that the masters should open, and the scholars should enter." St. Ambrose saith: *Remittuntur peccata per Dei verbum, cujus Levites est interpres:* "Sins be forgiven by the word of God, the expounder whereof is the priest."

Ambros. de Cain et Abel. lib. ii. [l. 212.]

Thus these and other like ancient fathers have opened the meaning of these keys: and yet were they never

therefore condemned of ignorance, as men that wist not what they said. Certainly Chrysostom saith: *Clavis est scientia scripturarum, per quam aperitur janua veritatis*: Chrysost. in Opere Imperfecto, hom. 44. [vi. app. 186.]
 “The key is the knowledge of the scriptures, whereby is opened the gate of the truth.” And St. Augustine saith: *Clavis est dicenda, qua ad fidem pectorum dura reserantur*: Augustin. de Sanctis, hom. 27. [v. app. 336.]
 “That ought to be called the key, wherewith the hardness of men’s hearts is opened unto faith⁴⁸.”

Here hath M. Harding well multiplied and increased his keys, and hath brought us forth a whole bunch of them altogether: “the keys of orders,” “the keys of jurisdiction,” “the keys of discretion,” “the keys of power,” “the keys most principal, and the keys not so principal.” And thus hath he keys of order without jurisdiction, and keys of jurisdiction without order: keys of discretion without power, and keys of power without discretion. And all these pretty shifts of keys hath he devised to avoid confusion: and to make up his tale, as if the pope’s cross keys were not sufficient, plagues and miracles, and I know not what things else, are brought forth unto us in the likeness of keys. “And this distinction and limitation of keys,” saith he, “hath upon good considerations been devised by the holy fathers.” And yet of all these holy fathers, for modesty’s sake, he nameth not one.

What answer were it best to make to such vanities? Indeed, when the right key of knowledge was lost and gone, it was time to devise some other pretty picklocks to work the feat. Bonaventura hereof writeth thus, as it is partly alleged before: *Omnes fere sacerdotes ita sunt simplices et idiotæ post susceptionem sacerdotii, sicut ante.....* Bonavent. 4. Sent. dist. 18. quæst. 1 E.

Dicendum ergo, quod scientia non est clavis principalis, nec per se, sed prout juncta est authoritati ligandi vel solvendi. Et hæc clavis non est de esse ordinis, sed de bene esse:
 “All priests for the most part are as simple and as rude after the receiving of priesthood, as they were before. Therefore we must say, that knowledge is not the principal key, nor any key at all of itself: but as it is joined with

⁴⁸ [August. de Sanct. hom. 27. This sermon is by the Ben. edd. attributed to Maximus.]

the authority of binding or loosing. And this key" (of knowledge) "is not of the substance of the order of priesthood, but of the better being of the same." And therefore to increase M. Harding's number of keys, he saith: *Quidam habent scientiam clavium: quidam claviculam: quidam nullam*: "Some have the knowledge of the keys: some a pretty little key: some no key at all." In this case it were good for M. Harding to resolve his reader, when the priest hath nothing else but a pretty little key, or no key at all, what authority he hath, either to open, or to shut.

Eodem loco.

Augustin.
contra Fau-
stum, lib. 19.
cap. 16. [viii.
321.]

M. Harding replieth further. "We have remission of sins in the ministration of the sacraments: therefore we have it not only by the hearing of the word of God." This objection is touched and partly answered a little before. St. Augustine calleth the sacraments *verba visibilia*: "words visible:" for that in them, as in lively images, the death of Christ is sensibly set before our eyes. For the word of God is the substance and life of all sacraments: and without the same, sacraments, whatsoever, are no sacraments. And therefore St. Augustine saith, as it is alleged before: *Quare non ait, Vos mundi estis propter baptismum, quo loti estis: sed ait, Propter verbum, quod locutus sum vobis? Nisi quia et in aqua verbum mundat. Detrahe verbum: et quid est aqua, nisi aqua?* "Why saith not Christ, You are clean because of the baptism wherewith ye are washed; but, Because of the word that I have spoken to you? Saving for that it is the word that cleanseth in the water. Take the word away, and what is water else, but water?"

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
80. [iii. pt. 2.
703.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 2.

Moreover that Christ's disciples did receive this authority, not that they should hear the private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings, as the common massing priests do everywhere nowadays, and do it so, as though in that one point lay all the virtue and use of the keys: but to the end

[Vol. iv. p.
19.]

they should do, they should teach, they should publish abroad the gospel, and be unto the believing a sweet savour of life unto life, and unto the unbelieving and unfaithful, a savour of death unto death : and that the minds of godly persons being brought low by the remorse of their former life and errors, after they once began to look up unto the light of the gospel, and believe in Christ, might be opened with the word of God, even as a door is opened with a key. Contrariwise, that the wicked and wilful, and such as would not believe nor return into the right way, should be left still as fast locked and shut up, and, as St. Paul saith, wax worse and worse. ^{2 Tim. iii. 13.} This take we to be the meaning of the keys : and that after this sort men's consciences be either opened or shut.

M. HARDING.

Here ye harp much upon one string, which so jarreth in the ears of the hearers, as your confuse harmony can like no man, unless he be a minstrel of your own sect. The authority and power of the keys consisteth not altogether nor principally in preaching or pronouncing of the gospel, as already we have proved. What may we judge of you? proceedeth this of malice or of ignorance, that thus ye confound the keys, the powers, and the ministries?.....

Preaching is one thing, to govern the church is another, to remit and retain sins is another, to distribute the sacraments is another. Doth not St. Paul in clear words speak severally and distinctly of ministries, where he saith, "That he was not sent of Christ to baptize, but to preach the gospel?" This doctrine of yours, whereby ye confound the keys, powers, and ministries, doth not only obscure the scriptures, and bring the people to great errors; but also, under pretence of a love toward preaching of the gospel, leadeth them into contempt of the sacraments, and specially of the sacrament of penance, without which, if after baptism we have sinned, (not being letted by case of necessity, wherein will, desire, and vows accepted,) ^a we cannot attain to salvation. As you follow Calvin your master in this and sundry other false and perilous doctrines, so it is to be feared, if your wicked temerity be suffered to proceed, that at length, having brought all religion to bare preaching, ye will abandon all the

1 Cor. i.

Calvin's wicked doctrine against the sacraments.

a Untruth: as by the answer may further appear.

b A great untruth joined with a slander. Read the answer.

sacraments of the church as things not necessary. For so that wicked master of yours teacheth: That, where Christ's death may be remembered otherwise, there ^ball the sacraments be superfluous. And that I seem not to slander him, I remit you to his Commentaries upon the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, where expounding these words, "Do this in my remembrance," he saith thus: "The supper is a token of remembrance ordained to lift up, or help, our infirmity: for if otherwise we were mindful enough of Christ's death, this help" (he meaneth the blessed sacrament of the altar) "were superfluous, which is common to all the sacraments, for they be helps of our infirmity." Lo, by Calvin's doctrine, if we remember the death of Christ, both the eucharist, and all other holy sacraments, be void and superfluous⁴⁹.....And then, because no other thing bringeth to our remembrance the death of Christ more than preaching, to what purpose serve all the sacraments?

Thus these defenders with their master Calvin have found a shorter way to heaven than was known before.....

In another place he seemeth to derogate much of the necessity of baptism of Christian men's children. Where he saith, that by reason of God's promise the issue which cometh of faithful parents ^cis born holy, and is a holy progeny, and that the children of such, being yet inclosed in the womb, before they draw breath of life, be nevertheless chosen into the covenant of life everlasting. This doctrine, when it shall take place, as by you defenders it is set in a good furtherance, what shall we look for, but that the necessary sacrament of baptism, (without which who is to be counted a Christian man?) and the most blessed and comfortable sacrament of the altar, and the wholesome sacrament of penance and absolution, and the rest of the sacraments, shall be no more esteemed and used, than now ye esteem and use the mass, holy bread, and holy water? This being once brought to pass, shall not the people easily be induced either to receive Mahomet's religion, or some other as far from God as that is, or to allow the pleasant trade of life of the ^dEpicureans, the most part being already thereto inclined, and no small number well entered?

But to return again to the keys, which seem to you to have no force ne use but in preaching: first, as touching the scornful scoffs uttered by you, sir defender, in Latin, and by your interpreter in English, against private confessions, and against the ministers of the church appointed by God for grace of reconciliation to be imparted to penitents: your light mocking spirit delighteth yourselves not so much, as it pitieth us to see you both so fast bound in Satan's fetters. Next concerning confession ^enecessarily required to the use and power of the keys, which you speak of at

Contra Interim.

c These be not M. Calvin's words, but St. Paul's: *Filii vestri sancti sunt*, 1 Cor. vii. Quid si cœlum ruat?

d Otherwise called the Romans.

e Untruth. For it is not required of necessity, as shall appear.

⁴⁹ [Harding adds: "So that by him, if a book, an image, a woman, a boy, a girl, or any other thing put a man in mind of Christ's death, the sacraments be needless."]

your pleasure, thus we say according to the scriptures : Among sundry effects, for which Christ gave the keys to the apostles and their successors, this is one, that by power of them they should remit and retain sins, as himself said, " Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them : and whose sins ye retain, they are retained." ^f But sins cannot duly be remitted or re-
f Untruths, two together. See the answer.
 tained, unless they be known to him that hath authority thereto, and knowledge of sins (specially such as are privy) cannot be had of man, who cannot see into the heart of man, ^f but by confession of the sinner : wherefore consequently it followeth, that they received this authority to hear the confession of Christian people desirous to be assoiled and reconciled.....

Wherefore the confession, yea of secret sins, is necessary to salvation by ^g the institution of Christ. For in that he instituted the end, he instituted also the means which should be necessary to the obtaining of the end : unless we would make Christ our lawmaker to have failed his church in things necessary. That sins cannot either be remitted or retained, except the priest know them, we are bold to say with the fathers, and specially with St. Hierom, who ^h so understood the words of Christ : where he promised the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter : *Sacerdos pro officio suo cum peccatorum audierit varias, scit qui ligandus sit, qui solvendus* : " The priest," saith he, " when as according to his office he hath heard the diversity of sins, knoweth who is to be bound, who is to be loosed." Right so as in the time of Moses' law, he pronounced not who was clean of lepre, who was not, before that he had viewed the colour, the bunches, and all other tokens of that disease. And thus it followeth of the words of Christ, that confession of all sins, at least deadly, must be made to the priest, before they can be remitted. Which priest is the minister of this sacrament, and hath authority to absolve, either ordinary, or by commission of the superior.

Again, for proof that confession is necessary, we say, that to remit and retain sins committed against God, as to bind and to loose, be judicial acts. And therefore by these words Christ ordained a court, a consistory, a seat of judgment in the church, and appointed the apostles and their successors to be judges. And that this may appear not to be a phantasy of our own heads, St. Augustine expoundeth these words of St. John in his Revelation : *Et vidi sedes*, &c. : " And I saw seats, and some sitting on them, and judgment was given." " We must not think," saith he, " this to be spoken of the last judgment, but we must understand the seats of the rulers, and the rulers themselves, by whom now the church is governed." And as for the judgment given, it seemeth not to be taken for any other than for that whereof it is said : " What things ye bind in earth, they shall be bound also in heaven : and what things ye loose in earth, they shall be loosed also in heaven." Sundry other fathers have uttered in

their writings the same doctrine. Hilarius upon the sixteenth chapter of Matthew saith : *Beatus cæli janitor*, &c. : "Blessed is the porter of heaven, whose earthly judgment" (that is to say, which is given here on earth) "is a forejudged authority in heaven," that what things be bound or loosed in earth, they have the condition of the same statute also in heaven. St. Cyprian hath the like saying in an epistle to Cornelius. Chrysostom saith : "That Christ hath translated all judgment which he received of the Father unto the apostles and priests." Gregory Nazianzen, in an oration to the emperor and his princes, saith to the emperor : *Ovis mea es, et nos habemus tribunalia* : "Thou art my sheep, and we have our seats of judgment." St. Gregory the pope compareth the sacrament of penance with a court of justice, in which causes be first examined and tried, and afterward judged. That the same is to be done by the priest, St. Bernard sheweth : who, as also the learned father Hugo de S. Victore : "Be not afraid to say after St. Cyprian, Hilary, and Chrysostom, that the sentence of Peter remitting sins goeth before the sentence of heaven. This ordinance of Christ requireth, that all trespasses, offences, disorders, transgressions and sins committed against him and his laws, be referred to this consistory."

Whether these defenders allow public confession or no, we know not : but whereas they inveigh against private confession, and say in spiteful words, which they have learned in the school of Satan, being loath the sins of the people, whereby he holdeth his kingdom, should be remitted, that Christ's disciples received not the authority of the keys, that they should hear private confessions of the people and listen to their whisperings : we tell them, that confession of all deadly sins is of the ⁱ institution of God, not of man. But concerning the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone, it is most agreeable to natural reason, that secret sins be confessed secretly.....

^k Clement amongst those things that he acknowledgeth himself to have received of Peter, this is one, as he writeth in his first epistle translated by Rufin the priest : "That if it fortune either envy or infidelity privily to creep into any man's heart, or any other like evil : he which regardeth his soul, be not ashamed to confess those things to him that is in office over him, to the end that by him, through the word of God and wholesome counsel, he may be healed. So as by perfect faith and good works he may escape the pains of everlasting fire, and come to the rewards of life that endureth for ever⁴⁶."...No man speaketh more plainly of secret confession ^l than Origen, and that in sundry places, to which for brevity's sake I remit the reader. *In 2. cap. Levitici, hom. 2. De Principiis, lib. 3. In Psal. xxxvii. hom. 2.* where he compareth the state of a sinner to a man that hath

⁴⁶ [Harding here quotes an irrelevant passage from Pseudo-Dionysius.]

This saying
pertaineth
not to con-
fession, but
to the au-
thority of
God's word.

ⁱ Untruth,
as it is pro-
ved before.
Confession
grounded
upon natural
reason.
^k A vain
forgery.

^l Untruth.
For he speak-
eth only of
open con-
fession.

In Matt. xvi.

Lib. i. epist. 2.

De digni-
tate Sacerd.
lib. 3.

evil and undigested humours in his stomach. And saith, that as by remaining of such evil matter the man feeleth himself very sick, and by vomiting of it forth he is eased : so the sinner, by keeping his sins secret, is the more grievously charged in his own conscience, and standeth in danger to be choked with the phlegm and humour of his sins. But if he accuse himself and confess his faults, he both vomiteth forth his sins, and digesteth the cause of the same. St. Cyprian, as in many other places, so most plainly speaketh of secret confession, *serm. 5. de Lapsis*. "Although," saith he of certain devout persons, "they be entangled with no great sin, yet because at least they thought of it, the same unto the priests of God confess they sorrowfully and simply. They make confession of their conscience, they lay forth the burden of their mind⁴⁷," &c.....

All this belongeth to open confession.

Confession of evil thought.

St. Augustine treating of the power of the keys in many places, but specially of confession in Psalm lx. where speaking much of the necessity of confession, he saith thus : "Why fearest thou to be confessed? If not being confessed thou remain hidden, not being confessed thou shalt be damned." And afterward thus : "To this end God requireth confession, to deliver the humble : to this end he damnable him that confesseth not, to punish the proud. Therefore be thou sorry before thou be confessed : being confessed rejoice, thou shalt be whole....."

By these and many other holy fathers, of whom there is no doubt but they had the Holy Ghost for their teacher and prompter of all truth, the catholic church hath been persuaded, that the recital and rehearsing of ^m all sins before the priest is necessary to salvation : unless necessity for lack of a priest or otherwise exclude us from it : and that a ⁿ general confession in no wise sufficeth..... True faith acknowledgeth, that confession is to be made of all sins, as ⁿ commanded by Christ and the apostles, commended to us by the ⁿ fathers of the primitive church, by all ⁿ learned doctors, and general use of the ⁿ whole church. And if the express term of "secret" or "auricular" confession be ^o seldom mentioned in the ancient fathers, as that of public confession is oftentimes, as in the Nicene council, and in sundry other places : that is nothing repugnant to the doctrine of the catholic church.

^m Untruth. Read the answer.

ⁿ Untruths, many and manifest, as shall appear.

^o Untruth. For it is never found. Otherwise let him shew it.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

All this great show of authorities, of fathers and doctors, M. Harding himself in the end dischargeth easily with one word. For, notwithstanding all that he could best devise

⁴⁷ [Harding farther alleges "St. Basil de Regul. Mon. Quæst. 288, as one translation hath : St. Ambrose lib. de Pœnit. : Paulinus in the life of St. Ambrose : St. Hierom

in Ecclesiasten cap. 10 : Leo in two Epistles, 57 ad episc. Camp. and ad Theodor. episc. 69 : Innocent. I. in Epist. ad Decentium, cap. 7."]

to say herein, his conclusion at the last is this: "The express term of 'secret' or 'auricular' confession is seldom mentioned in the ancient fathers." "Seldom," he saith, as if it were sometimes used, although but "seldom." But if he had left "seldom" and said *never*, I trow this tale had been the truer.

[Detect.
fol. 276 b.]

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding allegeth against me *Addition.* the authority of pope Leo, condemning public confession offered up in writing to be published openly to the people, and allowing rather confession made only privately to the priest: "Lest," saith Leo, "the penitents should be ashamed or afraid to open their deeds unto their enemies, of whom they may be troubled therefore by the ordinance of the laws," &c. *The answer.* The name of pope Leo is great: but his reasons are very weak. For touching the first reason, for that special cause, in old times, the penitents were forced to make open confession, to the end they might shew themselves ashamed of their sins, and be an example unto others. As for fear of enemies and troubles, and suits in law that might happen to grow upon such confessions, if the ancient holy fathers had cast such doubts, public confession had never been used. ¶

[Leo, epist.
80. ed.
Quesn. ep.
168.]

For the rest, we say, as before: we make no confusion of the keys. Our doctrine is plain, that there be two keys in the church of God: the one of "instruction," the other of "correction." Whereof the one worketh inwardly, the other outwardly. The one before God, the other before the congregation. And yet either of these standeth wholly in the word of God. And therefore St. Paul saith: *Omnis scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est ad doctrinam, ad reargutionem, ad correctionem, ad institutionem, &c.*: "All scriptures inspired from God are profitable to teach the truth, to reprove the falsehood, to correct the wicked, to nurture and inform the godly."

2 Tim. iii. 16.

Acts xvi. 31.

Of the former of these keys St. Paul saith: "Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be safe, with all thy house."

2 Cor. x. 4.

Of the other he saith: "The weapons of our warfare are not fleshly, but mighty through God, to throw down holds, casting down every high thing that is builded up against

the knowledge of God, and to bring all understanding captive to the obedience of Christ."

This doctrine seemeth to be simple and plain, and without confusion.

Touching M. Calvin, it is great wrong untruly to report so reverend a father, and so worthy an ornament of the church of God. If you had ever known the order of the church of Geneva, and had seen four thousand people or mo receiving the holy mysteries together at one communion, ye could not without your great shame and want of modesty thus untruly have published to the world, that by M. Calvin's doctrine, the sacraments of Christ are superfluous. Certainly to leave all that he hath otherwise spoken of the sacraments in general: of the sacrament of Christ's last supper, he writeth thus: *Magnum consolationis*, Institut. [lib. iv.] cap. 18. [leg. cap. 17.] 2. *[l. fiduciæ] ac suavitatis fructum ex hoc sacramento colligere possunt piæ animæ: quod illic testimonium habeant, (Christum sic nobis adunatum esse, sic nos illi vicissim insertos, adeoque⁴⁸) in unum corpus cum ipso coaluisse, ut quicquid ipsius est, nostrum vocare liceat:* "The godly minds may take great fruit of pleasure and comfort of this sacrament: for that therein they have a witness, that Christ is so made one with us, and we so grafted into him, and are so grown both into one body, that whatsoever is his, we may now call it ours."

"But Calvin," you say, "writeth thus: 'The supper is a token of remembrance, to lift up, or to help our infirmity. For if otherwise we were mindful enough of Christ's death, this help were superfluous.'" O, M. Harding, how far malice may bear a man! Because M. Calvin saith: "We are weak and have need of outward sacraments to quicken the dulness of our senses," saith he therefore, "that the sacraments be superfluous?" If he had likewise said, Our bodies be weak, and have need to be refreshed with meat and drink, would you gather hereof, that meat and drink are superfluous? Nay, contrariwise he concludeth: "We have need of sacraments: therefore sacraments be needful." And the greater our weakness is, the more need have we of such remedies. His words amongst many others of like

⁴⁸ [The words between brackets are not Calvin's but Jewel's.]

Institut.
[lib. iv.] cap.
16. [leg. 14.]
3.

sense be these: *Sic est exigua nostra fides, ut nisi undique fulciatur, atque omnibus modis sustentetur, statim concutitur, fluctuet, vacillet*: "So small is our faith, that unless it be borne up of every side, and by all means be maintained, it shaketh, it wavereth, and is like to fall."

Ecclesiast.
Hierarch.
cap. i. [p.
105.]

If this be so dangerous a doctrine as you tell us, why then are the ancient catholic fathers suffered to hold and maintain the same? Dionysius, whom you so often call St. Paul's scholar, writeth thus: *Nos imaginibus sensibilibus, quantum fieri potest, ad divinas adducimur contemplationes*: "We, as much as may be, by sensible images, or sacraments, are brought unto divine contemplations."

In Quæst.
Vet. Test.

Likewise St. Augustine saith: *Sacramenta propter carnales visibilia instituta sunt: ut ab illis, quæ oculis cernuntur, ad illa, quæ intelliguntur, sacramentorum gradibus transferamur*: "Visible sacraments are ordained for carnal men, that by the steps of sacraments we may be led from the things that we see with eye, unto the things that we understand." So saith St. Cyprian: *Fidei nostræ infirmitas sensibili [al. symboli] argumento edocta est, &c.*: "The weakness of our faith is taught by the understanding of the sacrament," &c. So St. Chrysostom: *Si incorporei essemus, nuda et incorporea nobis hæc ipsa daret. Nunc, quia corporibus insertas habemus animas, sub visibilibus spiritualia tradit*: "If we were bodiless, God would give us these things bare and bodiless. But forasmuch as we have souls fastened unto our bodies, therefore God giveth us things spiritual under things visible⁴⁹." Again he saith: *Rectis et fidelibus scripturæ non sunt necessariæ, dicente apostolo, Lex justis non est posita*: "To the godly and faithful the scriptures are not necessary: for so the apostle saith, There is no law provided for the just." And again: *Oportuerat quidem nos nihil indigere auxilio literarum, sed tam mundam (in omnibus) vitam exhibere, ut librorum vice gratia Spiritus uteremur*: "It behoved us to have no need of the scriptures: but in all things to shew our lives so pure and clean, that instead of books we might use the grace of the Holy Ghost."

† Cyprian.
de Cœna
Domini.
[app. cxi.]

† Chrysost.
ad pop. Anti-
och. hom. 6c.

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
22. In Opere
Imperf. [vi.
app. 102.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
1. [vii. 1.]

Hieronym.
in Proœmio
in Lamen.
Hieremie.
[v. 802.]

In like manner St. Hierom saith: *Cum meruerimus esse*

⁴⁹ [There are only twenty-one genuine Homilies ad pop. Antioch.]

cum Christo, et similes angelis fuerimus, tunc librorum doctrina cessabit: “When we shall obtain to be with Christ, and shall be like unto the angels, then the doctrine of books shall give place⁵⁰.”

Now tell us, M. Harding, must we hereof conclude, as you do, that these holy fathers, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, St. Hierom, St. Chrysostom, “held false and perilous doctrines, and with wicked temerity” (as you say) “would abandon both scripture and sacraments, as things not necessary?” Certainly for full resolution hereof, M. Calvin himself saith thus: *Facile patiar, ut, quæ Christus nobis dedit, salutis adjumenta, eorum usus necessarius dicatur: quando, scilicet, datur facultas. Quanquam semper admonendi sunt fideles, non aliam esse cujusvis sacramenti necessitatem, quam instrumentalis causæ, cui nequaquam alliganda est Dei virtus. Vocem sane illam nemo pius est, qui non toto pectore exhorreat, (sacramenta) res esse superfluas*: “I can well suffer that whatsoever helps of salvation Christ hath given us, the use thereof be counted necessary: I mean, when we may have opportunity and time to use them. Howbeit, thus much the faithful must be warned, that the necessity of any sacrament is none otherwise, but as of a cause instrumental: unto which cause we may not in any wise bind the power of God. But that the sacraments be things superfluous, no godly man can abide to hear it.”

Joh. Calvinus
in Antidoto
ad 7. Sess.
Concl. Tri-
dentini. [in
can. 4.]

Whereas you further charge M. Calvin for saying: “The children of the faithful are born holy,” ye should rather herewith have charged St. Paul. For thus he saith: *Nunc liberi vestri sancti sunt*: “Now are your children holy.” Ye should have remembered, M. Harding, that these be St. Paul’s words, and not M. Calvin’s. His meaning is, that the children of the faithful, notwithstanding by nature they be the children of anger, yet by God’s free election they be pure and holy. This is St. Paul’s undoubted doctrine: which notwithstanding, “he never neither despised the sacraments of Christ, nor led the people” (as you say) “to Mahomet or Epicure.”

Here at the last, M. Harding, to return, as he saith, to

⁵⁰ [The Bened. edd. pronounce this work spurious.]

his keys, "first beginneth with the spiteful words and scornful scoffs and light spirit of sir defender, which" (he saith) "he learned in the school of Satan, and now lieth bound in Satan's fetters."

To answer all such M. Harding's vanities, it were but vain. Wise men will not greatly weigh these childish tragedies.

But he saith: "The priest holdeth a consistory, and is a judge over the sins of the people. But being a judge he cannot discern sins unless he know them. Neither can he know them, but by confession. Therefore," saith M. Harding, "we tell them, that confession of all deadly sins is of the institution of God, and not of man. Marry," saith he, "touching the manner of confession secretly to the priest alone, it is most agreeable to natural reason that secret sins be confessed secretly."

Here, I beseech thee, good Christian reader, note this one thing by the way: M. Harding, contrary to common order, hath brought us the institution of God, without any manner word of God. "And thus," he saith, "we tell them:" as if his bare telling should stand for proof.

Verily notwithstanding Christ gave his apostles power of binding and loosing, yet it appeareth not that he spake any one word of secret confession. And Gratian a famous doctor of that side doubteth not to say: *Latentia peccata non probantur necessario sacerdoti confitenda*: "It is not proved, that privy sins ought of necessity to be confessed unto the priest." And again: *Datur intelligi, quod etiam, ore tacente, veniam consequi possumus*: "We are given to understand, that although we utter nothing with our mouth, yet we may obtain pardon or absolution of our sins." Therefore notwithstanding all this M. Harding's telling, his own doctor Gratian telleth him, that auricular confession is not God's institution.

But wherefore speaketh M. Harding so precisely and specially of "deadly sins?" or why may not his "venial sins" come likewise in the reckoning as well as others? Indeed it is specially provided in the late chapter at Trident, that little petite sins need not to be uttered in confession. And Robert Holcot saith: *De venialibus con-*

De Pœnit.
dist. i. Quis
aliquando.

De Pœnit.
dist. i. Con-
vertim.

Concil. Tri-
dent, cap. 5.
De Confessa.
[Harduin, x.
92.]
Rob. Holcot
in 4. Sent.
quæst. 4.

fiteri, magis est [congruitatis, et] supererogationis, quam necessitatis: "To make confession of *venial sins*, is more of devotion than of necessity." And Thomas of Aquine saith: *Quidam probabiliter dicunt, quod per ingressum ecclesiæ consecratæ, homo consequitur remissionem peccatorum venialium*: "Some say, and that not without good reason, that a man may obtain remission of his *venial sins*, only by entering into a church that is consecrate." And it is purposely noted in the Gloss upon the Decretals: *Venialia tolluntur, vel per orationem dominicam, vel per aquam benedictam*: "*Venial sins* may be removed, either by a *pater noster*, or by holy water." And therefore perhaps M. Harding will say, according to the judgment of these, and others his own doctors, that his "little pretty *venial sins*" ought not of duty to be reckoned in confession: but may otherwise be remitted, and have no need of Christ's blood. This is a shorter way to heaven, than either Christ or his apostles ever taught us.

4. Sent. quæst. 83. art. 3.

Extra de Penit. et Remiss. Omnis utriusque: in Glossa.

Howbeit, all this error seemeth first to have grown of mistaking these words of Beda: *Cœqualibus quotidiana et levia: graviora vero sacerdoti pandamus*: "Let us open our small and daily sins unto our fellows: and our great sins unto the priest."

Beda in 5. cap. Jacobi: citatur a Magistro 4. Sent dist. 17. [Nunc priusquam.]

For the rest, M. Harding's resolution may stand with good favour. For seeing his "auricular confession" can hold no better by divinity, that it may seem to hold by somewhat, he did well to say, "It holdeth well by natural reason."

M. Harding saith: "The priest can be no judge without particular knowledge of every sin: nor can he know without hearing: nor can he hear without confession." For answer hereto, Chrysostom saith, as he is before alleged: *Medicinæ locus hic est, non judicii: non pœnas, sed peccatorum remissionem tribuens: Deo soli dic peccatum tuum*: "Here is a place of medicine, and not of judgment: rendering not punishment, but remission of sins: open thine offences to God only."

Chrysost. de Penit. hom. 9. [li. p. 300.]

But if the priest can be no judge without knowledge, then doubtless, M. Harding, your priests, for the most part, can be no judges at all. For your own Peter Lom-

4. Sent. dist.
19. Post-
quam.

bard saith : *Scientiam discernendi omnes sacerdotes non habent* : " All priests have not knowledge to discern between sin and sin." And many of them be utterly ignorant, and know nothing.

Notwithstanding, be the priest never so wise or well learned, yet how is he able to enter into the breast of man, and to know the secrets of the heart? St. Paul saith :

1 Cor. ii. 11.

" What man knoweth what is in man, but the spirit of

1 Kings viii.
39.

man that is within him?" Solomon saith : " God only knoweth the thoughts of men." St. Paul saith : " God

Rom. viii. 27.

(only) searcheth the heart (and reins.)" And St. Augustine purposely speaking hereof, as it is said before, saith thus :

Augustin.
Confess. lib.
10. cap. 3.
[i. 172.]

Unde sciunt, cum a me ipso de me ipso audiunt, an verum dicam? " How know they, when they hear me speak of myself, whether I say truth or no?" Therefore the priest, judging that, that he cannot know, must needs wander uncertainly, and be a very doubtful judge.

Nevertheless, admitting the priest to be a judge, yet, if it may be proved, either that he may be a judge over the sins of the people, without particular knowledge of the same : or that he may come to certain and particular knowledge thereof without any manner " auricular confession," then, I trust, this whole matter will soon be answered.

First therefore I say, that a priest, having authority to pronounce the word of God, is thereby a judge over sin. For the word that he speaketh " is the power of God unto salvation : " " and a two-edged sword, able to sunder the soul and the spirit, and the marrow from the bones : and is able to judge" (for so St. Paul saith) " the thoughts and cogitations of the heart." And thus M. Harding himself granteth : " That a priest pronouncing God's words, may therewith both bind and loose." That is, in this case, to do the office of a judge. St. Augustine saith : *Clavis ea dicenda est, qua pectorum dura reserantur* : " That thing ought to be called the key, wherewith the hardness of the heart is opened ⁵¹."

Rom. i. 16.
Heb. iv. 12.

κριτικὸς
ἐνθυμήσεων,
καὶ ἐννοιῶν
καρδίᾱς.

Augustin. de
Sanct. hom.
26. [v. app.
336.]

Tertull. de
Pudic. p.
643. [cap. 21.
p. 574.]

So saith Tertullian : *Ipse clavem imbuit. Vides, quam? Viri Israelitæ, auribus mandate, quæ dico : Jesum Nazæ-*

⁵¹ [The authorship of this homily is doubtful : it was probably written by Maximus.]

rænum, virum a Deo vobis destinatum : “He endued the key. And know you what key? This key I mean : Ye Acts II. 22. men of Israel mark what I say : Jesus of Nazareth, a man appointed unto you from God.” These words, saith Tertullian, are the key. So saith St. Augustine : *Loquimur in auribus vestris. Unde scimus, quid agatur in cordibus vestris? Quod autem intus agitur, non a nobis, sed ab illo agitur. Prospexit ergo Deus, ut solvat filios mortificationum* : “We speak in your ears. But how know we what is wrought in your hearts? Howbeit, whatsoever is wrought within you, it is wrought not by us, but by God. God therefore hath looked forth, to loose the children of them that were appointed to death.” Thus is the priest a judge, and bindeth and looseth, without any hearing of private confessions.

Of the other side I say, that in open crimes and public penance, the priest is likewise appointed to be a judge. For notwithstanding in the primitive church, either the whole people or the elders of the congregation had authority herein, yet the direction and judgment rested evermore in the priest. And in this sense St. Paul saith unto Timothy : “Receive no accusation against an elder, unless 1 Tim. v. 19. it be under two or three witnesses.”

And notwithstanding these orders, for the greatest part thereof, be now utterly out of use, yet I trust it shall not be neither impertinent to the matter, nor unpleasant unto the reader, to consider how the same were used in old times. Therefore, as it is learnedly noted by Beatus Rhenanus, The sinner, when he began to mislike himself, and to be penitent for his wicked life, for that he had offended God and his church, came first unto the bishop and priests, as unto the mouths of the church, and opened unto them the whole burthen of his heart. Afterward he was by them brought into the congregation, and there made the same confession openly before his brethren : and further was appointed to make satisfaction by open penance. Which penance being duly and humbly done, he was restored again openly unto the church, by laying on of the hands of the priests and elders.

Hereof St. Paul saith unto the Corinthians : “If you 2 Cor. ii. 10.

have forgiven any thing to any man, I have likewise forgiven it. For I myself, whatsoever I have forgiven, I have forgiven it for your sakes in the person of Christ." In this limitation of penance, lest any thing should pass unadvisedly and out of order, the priest was appointed to be

Basil, quæst. 228, [leg. 288. tom. ii. §16.] οἰκείος τοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντος.

Augustin. in Enchirid. ad Laurentium, cap. 65. [vi. 220.]

the judge. St. Basil saith: *Modus conversionis debet esse conveniens illi qui peccavit*: "The order of conversion, or open penance, must be agreeable unto him that hath of-

fended⁵²." And therefore St. Augustine saith: *Quia plerumque*, &c.: "Forasmuch as for the most part the grief of one man's heart is unknown unto another, neither cometh forth into the knowledge of others, either by words or by other tokens, as being before him unto whom it is said, 'My mourning is not hid from thee:' therefore it is very well, that by them that have the oversight of the church, certain times of penance are appointed, that the congregation may be satisfied." Again he saith: *Hortor, prius*

Augustin. de Ecclesiast. dogmatibus, cap. 35. [leg. 53. al. 23. viii. app. 78.]

publica pœnitentia satisfacere, et ita sacerdotis judicio reconciliatum, communioni sociari: "I counsel him, that first he make satisfaction by open penance: that being so reconciled, he may afterward be restored unto the communion by the judgment and discretion of the priest⁵³." Like-

Cassiodor. lib. 9. cap. 53. [leg. 35.]

wise saith Cassiodorus: *Rei expectant communionis [al. commune] tempus, quod decrevit episcopus*: "The penitent parties wait for the communion time, appointed unto them by the bishop."

St. Ambrose demanded of the emperor Theodosius, being

Cassiodor. lib. 9. cap. 30.

then excommunicate: *Quibus medicamentis incurabilia vulnera tua, plagasque curasti?* "By what medicines have you healed your wounds and cuts, that were incurable?" The emperor answered: *Tuum opus est, et docere, et medicamenta temperare: meum vero, oblata suscipere*: "It is your part to instruct me, and to minister medicines: and it is my part to receive that you minister." And therefore

⁵² [St. Basil. qu. 288. (Regulæ brevius tractatæ.) . . . ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς ὁ τρόπος οἰκείος ὀφείλει εἶναι τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος (sic leg. Ben. al. ἁμαρτάνοντος) . . . ἀναγκαῖον τοῖς πεπιστευμένοις τὴν

οἰκονομίαν τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.]

⁵³ [This work is not by St. Augustine, but by Gennadius bishop of Constantinople, fl. A.D. 458, supra p. 501, note 42.]

Peter Lombard saith: *Etsi aliquis apud Deum sit solutus*, 4 Sent. dist. 18. Non autem. *non tamen in facie ecclesiæ solutus habetur, nisi per iudicium sacerdotis*: “Although a man be assoiled before God, yet is he not accounted assoiled in the face or sight of the church, but by the judgment of the priest.”

By these, M. Harding, I doubt not but ye may see that the priest may be a judge over sin, notwithstanding he never hear private confessions, nor have particular knowledge of every several sin.

This is that confession that the holy fathers have so often spoken of. It was made, not secretly, or in a corner: but publicly and openly, and in the sight of the congregation. Hereof Origen saith, as it is reported before: *Si quis sibi sit conscius, procedat in medium, et ipse sui accusator existat*: “If any man find himself guilty, let him come forth into the midst of the church, and let him be his own accuser.” Likewise Tertullian saith: *Advolvi presbyteris, et aris* [Ed. Prior. l. caris.] *Dei adgeniculari, et omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere*: “To fall down before the priests, to kneel before the altar or communion table, and to desire all the brethren to pray for him.”

Origen. in
Psal. xxxvii.
[hom. 2. ii.
686.]

Tertull. de
Pœnitentia
382. [c. 9.
p. 127.]

Touching St. Hierom, M. Harding, ye lay in his words as faithfully as Ananias sometime laid in his money at the apostles' feet. Ye serve us with a parcel, and hold back the rest. It is true that St. Hierom saith: “It is the priest's part to discern the diversity between sin and sin:” as in cases of excommunication, and public offences. But wherefore could ye not espy, or rather, why would you so closely dissemble, so many and so plain words going immediately before? For thus St. Hierom writeth of the power of the keys, and of the use of confession: *Istum locum episcopi et presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisæorum assumunt supercilio: ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur: cum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quærat*: “This place the bishops and priests not understanding, take unto them some part of the proud looks of the Pharisees: thinking themselves able either to condemn the innocent, or to

Hieronym.
in Matt. cap.
16. [iv. 75.]

absolve the guilty: *whereas indeed it is not the absolution of the priest, but the life of the sinner that is weighed before God.*" These words, M. Harding, would not thus have been dissembled if ye had meant simple dealing. St. Hierom saith plainly, That your bishops and priests understand not the use of the keys: that ye have taken upon you some part of the 'proud looks of the Pharisees:' and, that it is not the absolution of the priest, but the life of the party, that is accepted before God.

In the end he concludeth thus: *Alligat vel solvit episcopus vel presbyter, non eos qui insontes sunt, vel noxii, sed pro officio suo, cum peccatorum audierit varietates, scit qui ligandus sit, qui solvendus*: "The bishop or priest neither bindeth the innocent, or looseth the guilty: but according to his office, when he hath heard the diversity of sins," (as in public offences,) "he knoweth, who ought to be bound, who ought to be loosed." In like sort writeth Peter Lombard: *Dominus tribuit sacerdotibus potestatem ligandi et solvendi, id est, ostendendi hominibus ligatos, vel solutos*: "God hath given to priests power to bind and to loose, that is to say, to declare unto men that the penitents be either bound or loosed."

4. Sent. dist.
18. Nec ideo.
[leg. Non
autem.]

All this notwithstanding, albeit M. Harding were able to prove that the fathers had somewhere made mention of confession in secret, yet should not that greatly either further his purpose or hinder ours. For, abuses and errors removed, and specially the priest being learned, as we have said before, we mislike no manner confession, whether it be private or public. For as we think it not unlawful to make open confession before many, so we think it not unlawful, abuses always excepted, to make the like confession in private, either before a few, or before one alone. And as the holy fathers upon good considerations were forced to remove the use of open confession, even so we say, that upon like good considerations, private confession also may be removed.

Only this we say, that Christ, when he sent his disciples into the world, and gave them authority to bind and to

loose, made no manner mention of any such hearing of confessions, but only bade them, "Go and preach the gospel."

Hilary, Bernard, and Hugo, as ye have alleged them, seem to say: "That the judgment of man goeth before the judgment of God." Other the like, or rather more vehement speeches ye might have found in Chrysostom: *Cælum accipit auctoritatem judicandi a terra: judex sedet in terris*: Chrysost. in Esai. hom. 5. [vi. 132.]

Dominus sequitur servum: "Heaven taketh authority of judgment from the earth: in earth sitteth the judge: the Lord followeth the servant." These and such other the like extraordinary speeches, with good construction, may be comfortable to the afflicted mind. But as one said sometime, they must be received with a grain of salt: for otherwise, of themselves they be unsavoury. For St. Hierom saith, as I have alleged before: *Apud Deum non sententia sacerdotis, sed reorum vita quæritur*: Hieron. in Matt. cap. 16. [iv. 75.] "It is not the sentence or absolution of the priest, but the life of the penitent, that is accepted before God." And again⁵⁴:

Tunc vera est sententia præsentis, quando æterni [al. interni] sequitur sententiam judicis: al. 11. quæst. 3. Tunc vera. "Then the judgment of the president or priest is true," (not when it goeth before, but) "when it followeth the judgment of the everlasting Judge." And Gratian himself saith: *Non sacerdotali judicio, sed largitate divinæ gratiæ peccator emundatur*: De Pœnit. dist. 1. Con-vertimini. "The sinner is made clean, not by judgment of the priest, but by the abundance of the heavenly grace."

But Nazianzen, as he is here alleged, said unto the emperor: *Ovis nostra es*: "Thou art our sheep." No marvel. He meant that the emperor was one of the flock and fold of Christ. So St. Ambrose said sometime unto the emperor Valentinian: *Quid honorificentius, quam ut ecclesiæ filius dicatur imperator?.....Imperator enim bonus intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam est*: Ambros. ad Valent. epist. 32. [li. 873.] "What thing is there more honourable, than for the emperor to be called a child of the church? For a good emperor is within the

⁵⁴ [From the words "and again" it might appear, that the passage following was from St. Jerome; whereas Gratian quotes from St. Gregory.]

Chrysost. de
Verb. Esaiæ,
hom. 5.
[vi. 132.]

church, but not above the church." St. Chrysostom saith : *Deus ipse subjecit caput principis manui sacerdotis* : " God himself hath set the head of the prince under the hand of the priest." For, as touching faith and the obedience of the gospel, the highest prince is but a subject. All this proveth well the authority and dignity of God's word : but it maketh nothing for confession.

To conclude, M. Harding saith : " It hath been persuaded, that the reciting and rehearsal of all sins before the priest is necessary to salvation : and that a general confession is in no wise sufficient." And again he saith : " True faith acknowledgeth, that confession is to be made of all sins, as commanded by Christ and his apostles, commended unto us by the fathers of the primitive church, and by all learned doctors, and general use of the whole church."

Good reader, thou wouldest think that amongst so many great words there were some truth : and that M. Harding of his modesty, and for his credit's sake, would not speak so boldly without some good ground. But, I beseech thee, consider these few, and thereby judge indifferently of the rest.

Chrysost. in
Psalm. 50.
hom. 2. [v.
589.]

Chrysostom saith : *Non dico ut confitearis conseruo tuo peccata tua. Dicito Deo, qui curet ea* : " I will thee not to confess thy sins unto the priest, that is thy fellow-servant. Confess them unto God, that may heal them"⁵⁵.

Chrysost. in
Homil. de
Pœnitent. et
Confessione.
[Ed. Paris.
1558, tom. v.
771.—ed. Sa-
ville, v. 512.]

Again : *Cogitatione tua fiat delictorum exquisitio : sine teste sit hoc iudicium : solus Deus te confitentem videat* : " Examine thy sins in thy heart within thee : let this judgment be without witness : let God only see thee making thy confession." Beatus Rhenanus, a man of great reading

Beat. Rhe-
nan. in Ar-
gum. Libelli
Tertull. de
Pœnitentia.

and singular judgment, hereof writeth thus : *Tertullianus de clancularia ista confessione admissorum nihil loquitur... Neque eam usquam olim præceptam legimus* : " Tertullian

⁵⁵ [Chrysost. in Psalm. 50. hom. 2. This homily (which Saville doubtfully admitted into the genuine works of St. Chrysostom) is rejected by the Bened. edd. and

others, as being partly a transcript from the commentary of Theodoret on this Psalm. See ante, vol. i. 187, note ²⁶.]

of this privy confession of sins saith nothing. Neither do we read that the same kind of privy confession in *old times was ever commanded.*"

M. Harding saith: "It was commanded:" Rhenanus saith: "It was not commanded." If Rhenanus' words be true, as they be indeed, then are M. Harding's words most untrue. Likewise it is noted in the very Gloss upon M. Harding's own decrees: *Forte tunc (tempore Ambrosii)* De Pœnit. dist. 1. Pe-
trus in Gloss. *non erat facta institutio confessionis, quæ modo est:* "Perhaps then" (in the time of St. Ambrose, which was four hundred years after Christ) "the manner of confession that now is used was not appointed."

And Gratian saith: *Antequam sacerdoti ora nostra ostendamus, id est, peccata nostra confiteamur, a lepra peccati mundamur:* "Before we open our mouth unto the priest, that is to say, *before we make confession of our sins*, the leprosy of our sin is made clean." Theodorus saith: *Quidam Deo solummodo confiteri debere peccata dicunt, ut Græci:* "Some say, we ought to confess our sins *only unto God*, as do the Grecians." Peter Lombard, the chief founder of M. Harding's divinity, saith thus: *Sane dici potest, quod sine confessione oris, et solutione pænæ exterioris, peccata delentur per contritionem et humilitatem cordis:* "We may safely say, that *without confession of the mouth*, and absolution of the outward pain, sins be forgiven by the contrition and humility of the heart."

Briefly, Gratian having thoroughly debated the matter of both sides, that is to say, both for confession and against confession, in the end concludeth thus, as it is said before: *Cui harum sententiarum potius adhærendum sit, lectoris judicio reservatur. Utraque enim sententia fautores habet sapientes, et religiosos viros:* "Whether of these sayings it is best to follow, it is left to the judgment of the reader: *for either saying is maintained and favoured both by wise and by godly men.*" And whereas M. Harding saith: "Confession of all sins is commanded by Christ and his apostles," his own Gloss upon his own decrees openly reproveth his error, and teacheth him the contrary. The

De Pœnit.
dist. 5. In
Pœnitentia,
in Glossa.

words be these: *Melius dicitur, confessionem institutam fuisse a quadam universalis ecclesiæ traditione, potius quam ex Novi vel Veteris Testamenti autoritate*: "It is better said, that confession was appointed by some tradition of the universal church, than by any authority or commandment of the New or Old Testament."

Now, good Christian reader, I beseech thee, examine a little the truth of M. Harding's tale. First he saith: "The reciting and rehearsal of all sins before the priest is necessary to salvation:" Chrysostom answereth: "Let God only hear thy confession." There is one untruth. M. Harding saith: "General confession is not sufficient:" Peter Lombard answereth: *Sine confessione oris, &c.*: "Without any confession made by mouth our sins may be forgiven." There are two untruths.

M. Harding saith: "Confession of all sins is commanded by Christ and his apostles:" his own Gloss saith: "It is only a tradition of the church, commanded neither in the Old Testament nor in the New." There are three untruths. M. Harding saith: "It was commended unto us by the (4) doctors and fathers of the (5) primitive church." Rhenanus saith: "We read not that this kind of privy confession, in the old times, was ever commanded." And his own Gloss saith: "In the time of St. Ambrose" (which was four hundred years after Christ) "perhaps it was not used." There are four and five untruths. M. Harding saith: "It hath ever been allowed by all the learned doctors." His own Gratian answereth him: "The contrary hath been maintained and favoured both by wise and by godly fathers." There are six untruths.

To be short, M. Harding saith: "It hath been commended unto us by the general use of the whole church." Theodorus answereth him: "The whole church of Græcia useth it not." There are seven apparent and great untruths, disclosed by M. Harding's own doctors. He could not have comprisoned so much untruth in so narrow room, without some study.

Erasmus in
Schol. in
Epitaphium
Fabiolæ.

Erasmus, a man of great judgment, saith thus: *Apparet tempore Hieronymi nondum institutam fuisse secretam ad-*

missorum confessionem : quam postea ecclesia salubriter instituit : si modo recte utantur ea et sacerdotes et laici. Verum in hoc labuntur theologi quidam parum attenti, ut quod veteres scribunt de hujusmodi publica, et generali confessione,.....trahunt ad hanc occultam, et longe diversi generis : "It appeareth, that in the time of St. Hierom" (which was four hundred years after Christ) "secret confession of sins was not yet ordained : which notwithstanding was afterward wholesomely and profitably appointed by the church, so that it be well used, as well by the priests as by the people. But herein certain divines, not considering advisedly what they say, are much deceived : for whatsoever the ancient fathers write of general and open confession, they wrest and draw the same to this privy and secret kind, which is far of another sort."

Here, M. Harding, Erasmus telleth you, ye are foully deceived : and sheweth you also the cause of your error : for that, as he saith : "Ye consider not advisedly what ye either read or write : but wheresoever ye hear this word *confession*, ye imagine straightway it must needs be your own *auricular confession*, and can be none other."

Last of all, ye grant, "The express term of *auricular* or *secret confession* is seldom mentioned in the ancient fathers." Here wanteth, M. Harding, some part of your simplicity. If ye would have your reader to believe you, ye should have alleged certain of the ancient fathers, one at the least, if ye could have found so many that had at any time used the express term of *auricular* or *secret confession*. Otherwise it had been the better and plainer way to have confessed expressly, that the same express term is never used in any one of all the ancient fathers. Howbeit, if *auricular* or *secret confession* had then been used, it could never so long have lacked a name.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 3.

We say, that the priest indeed is a judge in this case, but yet hath no manner of right to challenge an authority, or power, as saith Ambrose.

De Pœnit.
dist. i. Verb.
Dei.

M. HARDING.

Whereas ye make preaching of the gospel to be the keys, how call ye the priest judge in this case? Preach ye never so much, the conscience of man being so secret a thing as it is, how can ye judge who inwardly and thoroughly repenteth, and who repenteth not? and though one repent, and be sorry, and have remorse of his former life, though he look unto the light of the gospel, as ye say, and believe in Christ, what then? how can ye judge of such a person? ^ado ye know his heart by looking in his face?.....

^a And do ye know his heart by tooting in his ear?

The priest, duly using the key of knowledge and discretion, doth the office of a judge, and as he seeth cause, either looseth or bindeth. As touching the priest's authority or power, which to challenge he hath no right, for so your interpreter maketh you to speak, and impute it to St. Ambrose: we deny that St. Ambrose saith ^beven very so. But, as we may gather of his words, as he meaneth that a priest exerciseth not the right of any his own proper power in remitting sins: so in the very place by you alleged, he saith the contrary to your doctrine. "For the right of loosing and binding," saith he, "is granted to priests only, and therefore the church challengeth it rightly, which hath true priests." Lo, he useth the word of challenge. Again in the same place he avoucheth, that he which receiveth the Holy Ghost, (whom priests receive when they be consecrated in the sacrament of order,) receiveth also power to loose and bind sins. For proof thereof he allegeth the scripture: "Take ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins ye remit, they are remitted: and whose sins ye retain, they are retained.".....And if you, defender, were accustomed to make your humble confession, and so to be assoiled, you should hear some ghostly father say to you, after certain other words, *Auctoritate mihi commissa ego te absolvo, &c.*

De Pœnit.
dist. 1. C.
Verbum Dei

^b Untruth. For the words be these: *Nul-
lus potestatis jura exer-
cet.*

John xx. 22.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In what sense the priest without hearing confessions may be a judge, we have sufficiently said before. Neither know I what phantasy M. Harding can have in so often rehearsal of one thing. With what words or colour of commission M. Harding can furnish out his authority, it forceth not greatly. Verily, without some show or countenance, his credit would not hold. Indeed Hugo and Bernard say: "The judgment of God followeth the judgment of man." And pope Julius saith: *Habet sacrosancta Romana ecclesia potestatem, singulari sibi privilegio concessam, aperire, et claudere januas regni cœlestis, quibus*

Concil. tom.
i. [Crabb.
p. 309.] de
Primatu
Rom. Eccles.

voluerit: "The holy church of Rome hath power granted unto her by singular privilege, to open and to shut the gates of the kingdom of heaven to whom she listeth." And cardinal Cusanus saith: *Hæc ligandi et solvendi potestas non minor est in ecclesia, quam in Christo*: "This power of binding and loosing is no less in the church, than it is in Christ."

Nicol. Cusan. ad Bohemos, epist. 2. [p. 835.]

But it is no great wisdom to give overmuch credit unto them that so often have deceived us. If their authority be so great as they make it, let them shew forth the words of their commission.

The saying of St. Ambrose is clear and plain: "*Verbum Dei dimittit peccata. Sacerdos est iudex. Sacerdos quidem officium suum exhibet: sed nullius potestatis jura exercet*:" The word of God forgiveth sins. The priest is the judge. The priest executeth his office: but he exerciseth the right of no power⁵²." And to this end in another place he allegeth the words of the prophet Esay, spoken in the person of God: *Ego sum, ego sum, qui deleo iniquitates tuas*: "I am he, I am he, that put away thine iniquities."

De Pœnit. dist. 1. Verbum Dei.

Ambros. de Noë et Arc. cap. 13. [l. 244.] Isa. xliii. 25.

And, to lay more weight to St. Ambrose's words, St. Augustine saith in like sense: *Officium baptizandi dominus concessit multis: potestatem vero et auctoritatem in baptismo remittendi peccata, sibi soli reservavit*: "Our Lord hath granted the office of baptizing unto many: but the power and authority in baptism to forgive sins, he hath reserved only to himself⁵³." So saith St. Ambrose: *Nostrum est, onera remittere: illius est, resuscitare: illius est, educere de sepulchro*: "It is our part to remove the stone from the grave" (by preaching, by counsel, and by exhortation): "but it is the Lord's work to raise up the dead: it is the Lord's work to bring him from the pit."

Augustin. de Scalis Paradisi. [vi. app. 164.]

Likewise again he saith: *Neque legatus, neque nuntius, sed ipse Dominus saluum fecit populum suum. Solus re-*

Ambros. de Pœnitent. lib. 2. cap. 7. [ii. 429.]

⁵² [The Ben. editors of St. Ambrose say, that Gratian, in professing to quote from that father's treatise De Cain et Abel, lib. 2. cap. 4, "nec verba nec sensum Ambrosii exhibet." Bp. Jewel,

as well as Harding, appears to have relied upon Gratian, without examining the original author.]

⁵³ [This treatise is not by St. Augustine, but by Guigo, an obscure writer of the 12th century.]

manet : quia non potest hoc cuicumque hominum cum Christo esse commune, ut peccata condonet. Solius hoc munus est Christi, qui tulit peccata mundi : “It is not the ambassador : it is not the messenger, but the *Lord himself* that hath saved his people. *The Lord remaineth alone. For no man can be partner with God in forgiving of sins. This is Christ’s only office,* that hath taken away the sins of the world.”

And yet is not therefore the priest’s office void of power. He hath power and commission to open the will of God, and, as St. Paul saith, “to speak unto the people, even as in the person of Christ.” So Tertullian saith : *Dandi baptismi jus habet summus sacerdos, id est, episcopus :* “The chief priest, that is to say, the bishop, hath right and power to give baptism.” But St. Augustine saith : *Ministerium dedit servis : potestatem sibi retinuit :* “God gave the ministry (of remission of sins) unto his servants : *but the power thereof he retained to himself.*” So when Christ sent out his disciples to preach the gospel, he gave them authority and power, as it is written in St. Luke.

If M. Harding will say, there is no power or authority in the reading or publishing of God’s word, his own doctor Hosius will tell him, that when the bishop ordereth a reader⁵³, even after the manner of the church of Rome, he saith unto him : *Habe potestatem legendi epistolas in ecclesia sancta Dei, tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis :* “Have thou power to read the epistles in the holy church of God, as well for the quick as for the dead.”

Indeed this is a very special power, such as, I trow, Christ and his apostles never taught us. Neither would I have noted it in this place, saving that Hosius, the profoundest proctor of that side, thought it a matter worth the noting. Such power therefore belongeth to priests and ministers in the church of God. But the power of giving remission of sin belongeth to God alone, and to none other.

If any man will presume further, St. Hierom saith, as it is alleged before : “He hath put on the proud looks of the

2 Cor. v. 20.

Tertull. de Baptismo, [cap. 17. p. 230.]

Augustin. in Johan. tract. 5. [iii. pt. 2. 323.]

Luke x. 19. ἐξουσίαν (καὶ δύναμιν).

Hosius in Confessione Petricovien. cap. 52. [fol. 54. col. 1.]

Hieron. in Matt. cap. 16. [iv. 75.]

⁵³ [Hosius is speaking not of a reader, but of a sub-deacon.]

Pharisees." And saith further, that such priests and bishops understand not the words of Christ. For, saith he, "It is not the judgment or absolution of the priest, but the life of the penitent that is regarded before God." And therefore St. Augustine saith: *Inde nata sunt schismata, ...cum homines dicunt, Nos sanctificamus immundos: nos justificamus impios: nos petimus: nos impetramus*: "Hereof grow schisms and divisions in the church, when men say, We sanctify the unclean: we justify the wicked: we pray: we obtain."

Augustin. de Fide et Operibus, cap. 14. [leg. in Epist. Johan. cap. 2. tract. 1. tom. iii. pt. 2. 831.]

Howbeit, here cometh in Richardus de Sancto Victore, God wot, with a full cold distinction between these two words, *dimittere* and *remittere*. For thus he saith: *Christus potuit dimittere peccata: nos vero non possumus dimittere peccata, sed tantum remittere*⁵⁴.

Rich. de Sancto Victore, de potestat. ligam. et solv. par. 1. cap. 24.

Peter Lombard saith much better: *Christus sacerdotibus tribuit potestatem ligandi, et solvendi, id est, ostendendi hominibus ligatos, vel solutos*: "Christ hath given power unto priests to bind and to loose: that is to say, to declare unto men who be bound, who be loosed."

4. Sent. dist. 18. Non autem.

So saith Bonaventura of the priests under the law of Moses: *Mundare dicebantur, quia mundatum ostendebant*: "They were said to cleanse the leprosy, because they shewed who was cleansed." So saith St. Augustine: *Nec voluntas sacerdotis obesse, vel prodesse potest, sed meritum benedictionem poscentis*: "The will of the priest can neither further nor hinder, but the merit of him that desireth absolution."

Bonavent. 4. Sent. dist. 1. [Dub. 6.] In Proemio. 1. quest. 1. Dictum est.

This therefore is the meaning of St. Ambrose: "The priest is a judge to discern between sin and sin, as well private as public. But right, power, or authority to forgive sins, he hath none."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 4.

And therefore our Saviour Jesus Christ, to reprove the negligence of the scribes and Pharisees in teaching, did with these words rebuke them, saying: "Woe be unto you scribes and Pharisees, which

⁵⁴ [This is the substance of what Rich. de S. Victore says.]

have taken away the keys of knowledge, and have shut up the kingdom of heaven before men."

Seeing then the key whereby the way and entry to the kingdom of God is opened unto us, is the word of the gospel, and the expounding of the law and scriptures, we say plainly, where the same word is not, there is not the key.

M. HARDING.

.....By this we are induced to grant, that the knowledge of the scripture is a key, whereby the gate to the truth is opened, the use whereof consisteth in expounding of the law and prophets, as they shew Christ. But we say, this not to be the special keys which Christ gave to the church, but one key alone. And so Christ calleth it, where he rebuked the scribes and Pharisees : though you have put it, otherwise than the gospel hath, in the plural number. And this key is common to the law and to the gospel. But the keys which we speak of are another thing. By the name of these keys we understand the whole spiritual power which Christ first promised to Peter, and afterward gave to the apostles, and from them is transferred to all bishops and priests. By which power priests teach the gospel, consecrate the body and blood of Christ, and minister the sacraments, through authority of the word absolve penitents, and excommunicate public and heinous sinners. The key that you confusely speak of, naming it to be the word of the gospel, and expounding of the law and scriptures, is one part pertaining to this spiritual power, it is not the whole power. And where this word is not, that is to say, where the scriptures be not taught, and the gospel preached, there is not the key, say ye : there is not the exercise of that key, say we. Yet there is this spiritual power, that is to wit, there be the keys. Yea, we say that a simple priest ^athough he have no great learning, yet hath he the keys, though he might do better, and more worthily use them, having learning and knowledge.

The knowledge of the scripture is a key.

a Untruth. The key of knowledge, without knowledge.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

M. Harding much and often complaineth of the confusion of the keys : for that we appoint not distinctly, as he saith, each key to his several office. Mark therefore, I beseech thee, gentle reader, how distinctly and plainly M. Harding himself entreateth of the same.

First, of the two keys that Christ hath delivered us in the gospel, he hath made a great many of keys : the key of

knowledge : the key of order : the key of power : the key of discretion : the key of sacraments : and, forasmuch as sacraments by his doctrine be seven in number, there must also be of this sort seven other several keys. And yet over and besides all these keys, being so many, the pope hath also one special master key. Afterward, by a sleight, and by nimbleness of his fingers, he conveyeth all this heap of keys into two only keys : whereof the one he calleth the key of knowledge, and the other the key of power : which two keys notwithstanding in the end are suddenly consumed both into one only key. For whereas the key of knowledge is lost, there, by M. Harding's judgment, power only remaineth without knowledge : and that key alone dischargeth all offices, and is utterly all in all.

This key of power without knowledge must needs be the key of ignorance : or, as they themselves have used to call it, *clavis errans*, "the key of error." Of which key undoubtedly Christ said sometime, *Hoc est tempus vestrum, et potestas tenebrarum*, "This is your time, and the power of darkness." Peter Lombard himself saith : "Many priests be ignorant, and have not the key of knowledge." Alexander of Hales saith : *Scientia non est clavis* : "Knowledge is no key at all."

De Penit.
dist. 1. Ver-
bum Dei.
Luke xxii. 53.

4. Sent. dist.
19. Post-
quam.

Alexand. de
Hales, par. 4.
quæst. 79.
[Mem. 3.
art. 1.]

Yet M. Harding answereth us, that the simple ignorant priest, that knoweth nothing, hath not only one key, but both keys, (for so he calleth them in the plural number,) that is to say, as well the key of knowledge, as the key of power. And thus have they forged a key of knowledge, without knowledge : and with the same key they expound and open the scriptures : they minister the sacraments : they bind : they loose : and break up a by-way into the kingdom of heaven. Yet must we believe that they speak simply and plainly of these keys, and without confusion.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis. 5.*

And seeing one manner of word is given to all, and one only key belongeth to all, we say, there is but one only power of all ministers, as concerning

opening and shutting. And as touching the bishop of Rome, for all that his flattering parasites sing these words in his ears, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," (as though these keys were fit for him alone, and for nobody else,) except he go so to work, as men's consciences may be made pliant, and be subdued to the word of God, we deny that he doth either open or shut, or hath the keys at all.

And although he taught and instructed the people, (as would God he might once truly do, and persuade himself it were at the least any piece of his duty,) yet we think his key to be never a whit better, or of greater force than other men's. For who hath severed him from the rest? who hath taught him more cunningly to open, or better to absolve than his brethren?

M. HARDING

Your ground being false, what ye build thereon soon faileth. The whole power of the keys pardy (how oftentimes must we tell you one thing?) standeth not in preaching only, but in sundry other excellent ministries also, as we have proved. If the bishop of Rome preach not, he doth neither open nor shut by preaching we grant. Yet men's consciences being made pliant and subdued by the word of God, by others that preach at his appointment, he may by virtue of the keys, either open or shut, loose or bind, as by discretion he seeth cause. And whereas Christ said to Peter, and therefore to the bishop of Rome Peter's successor, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven:" will ye call them flattering parasites, that yield to him that which Christ gave to him? Such vomit sheweth what humour your stomach is charged withal. Denying the bishop of Rome, whom, for all the spite ye bear toward him, ye must acknowledge to be a bishop, to have the keys at all, unless he preach in his own person, ye declare your great ignorance and foul temerity. Know ye not, that a power annexed to an order and vocation is not taken away from one by not exercising the same in his own person?.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The effect hereof, besides other ordinary idle talk, standeth in two points. First, M. Harding saith: "The pope, though he do nothing himself in his own person, yet he may sufficiently feed the flock of Christ, and bind and loose, and discharge all duties by his deputies and under-vicars," that is to say, by his cardinals and bishops, which are as careful and zealous for their offices, and tender their charge, as much as he. This ground, I trow, is not false: and therefore whatsoever M. Harding shall build thereon, it can never fail. Notwithstanding, I do not remember that either Christ or his apostles ever used to do the like. One said sometime: *Impudens est imperator, qui, cum alienis oculis omnia ei agenda sint, postulet sibi aliorum capita, et fortunas committi*: "He is a shameless captain, that whereas he must needs guide all things by the eyes of others, will require other men's lives and goods to be committed to his hands."

Tit. Liv. Decad. 3. lib. 6. [cap. 22.]

Pope Damasus saith: *Illi episcopi, qui talia sibi præsumunt, videntur mihi similes esse meretricibus: quæ statim, ut pariunt, infantes suos aliis nutricibus tradunt educandos: ut suam citius libidinem explere valeant. Sic et isti infantes suos, id est, populos sibi commissos, aliis educandos tradunt, ut ipsi suas libidines expleant, id est, ut pro suo libitu sæcularibus curis inhient, et quod cuique visum fuerit, liberius agant*: "Such bishops taking such matters upon themselves, seem like unto harlots: which, as soon as they be once delivered, straightway deliver out their children unto nurses, that they may the rather follow their pleasures: even so these bishops deliver over their children, that is to say, the people committed to their charges, to be reared and brought up by others, that they themselves may the better accomplish their pleasures, that is to say, that they may give themselves over to worldly cares, and do whatsoever shall like them best."

Damasus
Papa epist.
4. [Crabb.
tom. i. 388.]

Further, saith M. Harding, Christ said unto Peter: "To thee will I give the keys: feed my sheep: confirm thy brethren:" *ergo*, The pope is a lord paramount, and hath a

Petr. de Palud. de potest. collata Apost. art. 1. [leg. 2.]

power peerless over all the world. Peter of Palus hereof writeth thus: *Christus dixit apostolis, Quæcunque ligaveritis in terra, erunt ligata et in cælo: non dixit, In cælis, sicut Petro dixerat: sed in cælo uno. Unde [leg. quia] non sunt tantæ perfectionis, sicut Petrus.* “Christ said unto the apostles, Whatsoever ye shall bind in earth, it shall be bound in *heaven*. He said not, It shall be bound in *heavens* as he said to Peter: but in *one heaven*. Therefore the other apostles were not of such perfection as Peter was.”

Petr. de Palud.

Again he saith: *Illa verba, Quæcunque ligaveris, intelliguntur de utroque foro, et de utraque potestate. Illa autem verba, Quorumcunque ligaveritis, intelliguntur tantum de foro conscientie:* “These words,” (spoken unto Peter,) “‘Whatsoever thou shalt bind,’ are understood of both courts, as well of the court of judgment, as of the court of conscience. But these other words,” (spoken unto the other apostles,) “‘Whatsoever you shall bind,’ &c. are understood only of the court of conscience.”

Origen. in Matt. tract. 6. [iii. 613, 614.]

This phantasy it seemeth he learned out of these words of Origen: *Non modica differentia est, quod Petro quidem datæ sunt claves, non unius cæli, sed multorum cælorum: ut quæcunque ligaverit super terram, sint ligata, non tantum uno in cælo, sed etiam in omnibus cælis. Ad alios dicit, ut solvant et ligent, non in cælis, sicut Petrus: sed in uno cælo: quia non sunt in tanta perfectione, sicut Petrus, ut ligent et solvant in omnibus cælis:* “The difference is great: for unto Peter are given the keys, *not of one heaven*, but of *many heavens*: that, whatsoever he bindeth in earth shall be bound, *not only in one heaven*, but also in *all the heavens*. But unto the rest he giveth power to bind and loose, *not in the heavens*, as Peter doth, but in *one heaven*: for that they were not in such perfection as Peter was, to bind and loose in *all the heavens*.”

This multiplication of heavens, as I have said, is but a phantasy: and yet to M. Harding’s purpose it maketh nothing. For Origen, by this word Peter, meant not Peter the apostle, but any other godly learned priest or bishop: whom he expresseth here under the name of Peter. For

it followeth immediately: *Ergo, quanto melior fuerit, qui solvit, tanto beatior erit, qui solvitur: quoniam in omnibus solutus est cœlis*: "Therefore the better man he is that looseth, the more blessed is he that is loosed: for that he is loosed *in all the heavens*." Again he saith: *Quod si nos idem loquimur, quod Petrus loquutus est,.....efficimur* Origen, in Matt. tract. 1. [iii. 614.]
Petrus. Et nobis dicetur, Tu es Petrus. Petra enim est, quisquis est discipulus Christi: "If we speak the same that Peter spake, we are *made Peter*. And unto us it shall be said, *Thou art Peter*. For he is the rock, *that is the disciple of Christ*." [In eodem Tract. p. 523.]

And again he saith: *Hoc dictum, Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum, cæteris quoque commune est. Et, quæ sequuntur, velut ad Petrum dicta, sunt omnium communia*: "This saying, To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, is common to the rest of the apostles. And the words that follow, *as spoken unto Peter, are common unto all*." [In eodem Tract. p. 525.]

So saith St. Augustine: *Petrus, quando accepit claves, ecclesiam sanctam significavit*: "Peter, when he received the keys, signified the holy church." So saith St. Basil: *Petre, inquit, Amas me? Pasce oves meas: et consequenter omnibus pastoribus et doctoribus eandem potestatem tribuit. Cujus signum est, quod omnes ex æquo et ligant et absolvunt quemadmodum ille*: "Christ said unto Peter, Lovest thou me? Feed my sheep. And in like sort unto all pastors and doctors he gave *the same power*. A token whereof is this, that all others *bind and loose equally, as well as Peter*" Augustin. in Johan. tract. 50. [iii. pt. 2. 633.]
Basil. in Vita Solitar. cap. 22. [ii. 573.]

Likewise said St. Ambrose: *Dominus dixit Petro, Pasce oves meas. Quas oves, et quem gregem non solum tunc beatus Petrus suscepit, sed et nobiscum eas suscepit, et cum illo eas nos suscepimus omnes*: "Our Lord said unto Peter, Feed my sheep. Which sheep and flock *not only blessed*" Ambros. de Dignit. Sacer. cap. 2. [ii. App. 359.]

⁵⁴ [This work, entitled in the older edd. of St. Basil "De vita Solitaria," is called by the Bened. ed. "Constitutiones Monasticæ." Doubts have been expressed as to the genuineness of the Ascetics in

general, though most authors have acknowledged the genuineness of that portion of them called "Constitutiones Monasticæ." The Bened., however, impugn it in their preface to St. Basil's Works.]

Peter then received, but he received the same *together with us* : and all we have received *the same together with him* ⁵⁵.” Likewise St. Cyprian : *Christus eandem* [leg. *parem*] *dedit* [leg. *tribuit*] *apostolis omnibus potestatem* : “ Christ gave unto all his apostles *like and equal power*.”

Cyprian, de
Simpl. Præ-
latorum. [p.
195.]

Beda in Ho-
mil. in E-
vang. Quem
me dicunt.
[Hom. æstiv.
de tempore.]

So likewise saith Beda : *Potestas ligandi et solvendi, quamvis soli Petro a Domino data videatur, tamen absque ulla dubietate noscendum est, quod et cæteris apostolis data est* . . . : “ The power of binding and loosing, notwithstanding it seem to be given only unto Peter, yet without all doubt we must understand that it was given also to the rest of the apostles.”

Briefly, M. Harding’s own scholastical doctors confess, that the power of the apostles was one and equal. But they say, that the whole multitude of the church was committed only unto Peter, and not likewise to any other : and that therein only standeth all the difference. Hervæus saith : *Quamvis omnes apostoli eandem habuissent a Christo et æqualem potestatem clavium, et jurisdictionis, tamen jurisdictionem, sive materiam subjectam, non habuit nisi Petrus, et cui eam Petrus committere voluit* : “ Notwithstanding the apostles received of Christ *equal power of the keys and jurisdiction*, yet the jurisdiction or matter wherein to use their power, none had, but *only Peter*, and to whomsoever Peter would commit the same.” And thus he imagineth that all the apostles, saving only Peter, had keys given them, but no house to open : and jurisdiction of government, but no people to govern.

Johan. de
Paris, de po-
test. Regia
et Papali,
cap. 12.

Alphons. ad-
vers. Hæres.
lib. 2. de Ab-
solv. [p. 107.]

Verily Alphonsus de Castro saith : *Quando absolvit simplex sacerdos, tantum absolvit de culpa, sicut papa* : “ When a simple priest absolveth, *he absolveth as much touching sin, as doth the pope*.”

But touching the pope, how great soever he fancy his key to be above all others, if he never use the same, and if he either know not or utter not the word of God, we say, as before, well may he shut up the kingdom of God before men : but open it he cannot. Origen saith : *Qui funibus*

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
1. [iii. 531.]

⁵⁵ [The Bened. consider this as spurious, and attribute it to Sylvester II. pope A. D. 999.]

peccatorum suorum constringitur, frustra vel ligat, vel solvit :

“He that is bound with the bands of his own sins, bindeth and looseth but in vain.”

To conclude, St. Augustine saith: *Cum Petro dicitur, omnibus dicitur, Amas me? Pasce oves meas :* “These words of Christ, ‘Lovest thou me? Feed my sheep:’ when they are spoken unto Peter, they are spoken unto all priests or ministers.” He addeth further: *Itaque miseri, dum in Petro Petram non intelligunt, et nolunt credere, datas ecclesiæ claves regni cœlorum, ipsi eas de manibus amiserunt :* “Therefore wretched men, while in Peter they understand not (Christ, that is) the Rock, and while they will not believe that the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given” (not unto Peter alone, but) “unto the church, they have quite lost the keys out of their hands.”

Augustin.
de Agone
Christiano,
cap. 30. [vi.
260.]

Augustin.
de Agone
Christiano,
cap. 31.
[ibid.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. *Divis. 1.*

We say, that matrimony is holy and honourable in all sorts and states of persons, as in the patriarchs, in the prophets, in the apostles, in the holy martyrs, in the ministers of the church, and in bishops: and that it is an honest and lawful thing, as Chrysostom saith, for a man, living in matrimony, to take upon him therewith the dignity of a bishop.

M. HARDING.

Matrimony is holy and honourable in all persons, and an undefiled bed, as saith St. Paul. Yet is it not lawful for them to marry, ^a which either have by deliberate vow dedicated all manner their chastity unto God, ^b or have received holy order. For the vowed be forbidden marriage, by express word of God: Those that have taken holy orders, by tradition of the apostles, and ancient ordinance of the church.

a Untruths,
two together,
as better ap-
peareth by
the answer.

Touching the first, the scripture is plain: because a vow is to be performed, *Vovete et reddite Domino Deo vestro :* “Vow ye and pay” (or render that ye vow) “to our Lord God.” Christ also saith in the gospel: “There be some eunuchs that have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. He that can take, let him take.” Again St. Paul speaking of young widows, which have vowed and promised chastity, saith, that “when they wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, having

[Vol. iv. p.
20.]

Heb. xlii. 4.

Psalm. lxxv.
[12. Vulg.]

Matt. xix. 12.

The first faith
St. Hierom
expoundeth,
The faith of
baptism. See
the answer.

damnation, because they have broken their first faith." Whether these scriptures pertain hereto, and be thus to be understood, we refer us to the primitive church, and to all the holy fathers...

Such marriages, or rather slidings and falls from the holier chastity that is vowed to God, St. Augustine doubteth not but they be worse than advoutries. St. Cyprian calleth this case plain incest. St. Basil accounteth the marriages of veiled virgins to be void, of no force, and sacrilegious.

"She that hath desposed herself to our Lord," saith St. Basil, "is not free. For her husband is not dead that she may marry to whom she list. And whiles her immortal husband liveth, she shall be called an advoutress, which for lusts of the flesh hath brought a mortal man into our Lord's chamber.".....

Touching the second, the apostles forbid those that come single to the clergy to marry, except such as remain in the inferior orders, and proceed not to the greater, as we find in their canons: can. 25. Paphnutius, as Socrates and Sozomenus record in their ecclesiastical story, said at the Nicene council, that "it was an old tradition of the church, that such as come to the degree or order of priesthood single should not marry wives." And this is that holy bishop Paphnutius, whom these evangelical vow-breakers pretend to be their proctor for their unlawful marriages...

Clerks bound
to conti-
nency. Lib. 1.
cap. 11.

Paphnutius,
lib. 1. cap.
23. [Sozom.
lib. 4. f.]

This pope
Siricius
shamefully
abuseth the
words of
St. Paul, and
condemneth
all marriage.

Read who list the epistle of *Siricius ad Himerium Tarracensem*, cap. 7., the second epistle of Innocentius to Victricius bishop of Rouen, cap. 9., and his third epistle to Exuperius bishop of Toulouse, cap. 1., and weighing well these places, he shall perceive, that these holy popes forbade the ministers of the church the use of wedlock by the same reason, by which the priests of Moses' law were forbidden to come within their own houses in the time when their course came to serve in the holy ministeries. By the same reason also by which St. Paul requireth married folk for a time to forbear the use of their wives, that they might attend praying.

The place of Chrysostom alleged by this defender, well considered, disproveth no part of the catholic doctrine in this behalf, but condemneth both the doctrine and common practice of his companions, these new fleshly gospellers. His words be these upon the saying of St. Paul, "that a bishop ought to be without crime, the husband of one wife." "The apostle," saith he, "stop-
peth the mouths of heretics which condemn marriage, shewing, that it is not an unclean thing, but so reverend that with the same a man may ascend to the holy throne or seat," (he meaneth the state of a bishop,) "and herewith he chastiseth and restraineth the unchaste persons, not permitting them, who have twice married, to attain such a room. For whereas he keepeth no benevolence toward his wife^b deceased, how can he be a good governor? yea what grievous accusations shall not he be subject unto daily? For ye all know right well, that albeit by the laws the second marriages be permitted, yet that matter lieth open to

1 Cor. vii.

Answer to
Chrysos-
tom's place.
In 1. cap. ad
Timoth.
hom. 2.

^b Untruth.
For M. Hard-
ing foully
mistaketh
St. Chry-
sostom's
meaning.

Twice mar-
ried may not
be bishops,
and why.

many accusations." And therefore he would a bishop to give no occasion (of evil) to those that be under him. He putteth bigamy, ^cthat is to wit, marrying another after the first or a widow, to be lawful rather than commendable.

^c Untruth, standing in false exposition.

Strumpets.

So we see the impure bigamy of our holy gospellers, condemned both by Chrysostom and St. Paul, of whom many being priests, and (as they say) bishops, at least presuming to occupy that holy seat, for custody of their chastity, after their former old yoke-fellows' decease, solace themselves with new strumpets. By a better name I would call them, if I wist I should not offend. For what woman soever coupleth herself in such damnable yoking, how can she appear either to be honest, or to have care of her soul's health? As for the simple that be deceived by the importunity and craft of those Lurdens, as they are not to be borne withal, so yet I think them to be pitied.

But if this defender press us with Chrysostom, we answer, that though Chrysostom grant that a married man may ascend to the holy seat, yet he saith not, that a man may descend from that holy seat to the bride bed. For we deny utterly, that any man, after that he hath received holy orders, may marry. ^dNeither can it be shewed, that the marriage of such was ever accounted lawful in the catholic church. Indeed we know, that in Germany, and in England, and certain other provinces at dissolute times, when the discipline of the church was shaken off, priests have been married, as we read of the time in which Anselmus was bishop of Canterbury. But that disorder was always by ^edue correction of bishops punished and redressed.

^d Untruth. For it was undoubtedly counted lawful.

^e That is, by allowing of concubines.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, I grant, M. Harding is like to find some good advantage, as having undoubtedly a great number of the holy fathers of his side. For single life, in the eyes of politic wise men, for many causes seemeth worthy of favour. But, good Christian reader, that thou mayest be the better able to see and judge, how uprightly and indifferently the fathers have dealt herein, either in the advancing of virginity, or else in the disgracing of lawful matrimony, it may please thee to consider the form and manner of their sayings.

Indeed Origen saith: *Potest aliquis de castitate plus sapere, quam oporteat sapere*: "A man may think more of chastity, than is convenient." Likewise saith St. Hierom: *Declinare ad dextram, est abstinere a cibis, quos Deus creavit, et condemnare matrimonium, et incurrere in illud*,
^{Origen. in Epist. ad Rom. cap. 12. lib. 9. [iv. 647.]}
^{Hieronym. in Malach. cap. 2. [iii. 1818.]}
^{Vos autem recessistis,}

After holy orders received, marriage never counted lawful among catholics.

Priests married in England in the time of Anselmus.

quod dictum est, Noli justus esse nimium : “To turn to the right hand, is to abstain from meats which God hath made, and to *condemn matrimony* : and to fall into the danger of the words written by the wise man, ‘Never be over just.’”

First therefore Tertullian, in the disproof of matrimony, saith thus : *Ecquid tibi videtur stupri affine esse [secundum] matrimonium ? Quoniam [ea] in illo deprehendo, quæ stupro competunt* : “Dost not thou think, that *matrimony is like unto fornication* ? Certainly I find the same things in the one, that I find in the other.” Further he saith : *Ergo, inquires, jam et primas, id est, unas nuptias destruis. Nec immerito : quoniam et ipsæ ex eo constant, quod [quo] est stuprum* : “Then, thou wilt say to me, thou condemnest also the first marriage. Yea verily, and not without cause : for both *matrimony and fornication consist both of one thing*.”

Tertuli. in Exhort. ad Castitatem, p. 458. [cap. 9. p. 522.]

Eodem loco. [p. 523.]

Chrysost. in Opere Imperfecto, hom. i. [vi. app. p. 24.]

Chrysostom saith : *Hæc ipsa conjunctio maritalis malum est ante Deum. Non dico, Peccatum, sed malum* : “The very copulation of matrimony is *an evil thing before God*. I say not, It is sin : but I say it is *an evil thing*.” And yet immediately after he saith : *Si in maritis et adulteris una est libido, quomodo potest fieri, ut una eademque res pro dimidia parte sit justitia, pro dimidia autem sit peccatum ? Aut enim tota est justitia, aut tota est peccatum : quia res una est* : “If the married man and the advouterer have one kind of pleasure, how can it be, that one and the selfsame thing for the one half should be righteousness, and for the other half should be sin ? Either it is all sin, or all righteousness : *for the thing itself is one*.”

M. Harding, fol. 283 b.

Addition. ¶ Here M. Harding saith : “I do falsely de- Addition.
mean myself, and beguile my unlearned reader. For the author by these words *conjunctio maritalis*, meant not the copulation of matrimony as you translate it, as though he said, Matrimony itself were an evil thing : God forbid any should so speak of God’s holy ordinance. But he meaneth the conjunction of the husband with his wife in the act of generation.” Besides all this, he telleth us of *fides, proles*, and *sacramentum* : of *malum culpæ*, and *malum pœnæ* :

M. Harding, fol. 284 a.

of immoderate concupiscence, inordination, and rebellion of the flesh, &c. And all to excuse these words written in *Opere Imperfecto*, under the name of Chrysostom, "The copulation of matrimony, or the conjunction of man and wife, is an evil thing before God." *The answer.* First, M. Harding, where you chargè me with false translation and corruption of mine author, besides that my words of themselves be plain enough, I meant also the very same thing that you mean. Only I sought to express my meaning modestly, and in comely terms without offence. Neither ever was there any heretic, that I have heard of, that condemned the very state of matrimony of itself, otherwise than in respect of the conjunction that followeth afterward. Therefore it was needless for you so pitifully to cry out: "God forbid any man should so speak of God's holy ordinance, to say, that matrimony itself were an evil thing." M. Harding, fol. 283 b. And yet God ordained, not only the state of matrimony itself, but also the very act itself of generation. And therefore you have brought us a vain distinction, M. Harding, without sense or savour. You might better have said: "God forbid that any man should say, The act of generation itself were an evil thing, or should so speak of God's holy ordinance."

But you tell us a tale of *malum pœnæ*, and *malum culpæ*. *Malum pœnæ* is that necessity, infirmity, and misery that is fixed and mortised unto our bodies, as care, trouble, hunger, thirst, sickness, death, and such other. But are these ill things before God? are these the things whereof St. Paul complaineth of himself, saying: "I do not that good thing that I would do: but I do that evil thing that I would not do?" Rom. vii. 19.

You will say: "The author of the work called *Opus Imperfectum* speaketh not of these natural infirmities of the body: but of that concupiscence, which you call a rebellion of the flesh." If the author meant thus, then, I pray you, against what thing doth concupiscence work this rebellion? You must needs say: "Against the will and Spirit of God." For so saith St. Paul. And will you say, This is only an ill thing? it is no sin? Is it no sin to rebel

against God's Holy Spirit, and to withstand his will? Verily St. Augustine saith plainly: *Concupiscentia carnis, adversus quam bonus concupiscit Spiritus, et peccatum est, et pœna peccati, et causa peccati*: "The concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good Spirit desireth or laboureth, is both sin itself, and also the pain of sin, and the cause of sin." Here St. Augustine saith, that the same concupiscence and rebellion, whereof you speak, is not only an evil thing, but also very sin indeed. Therefore leave this niceness, M. Harding, and tell us plainly, that the conjunction of man and wife is not only an evil thing, but also sin before God.

Augustin.
contra Jul.
lib. 5. cap. 3.
[x. 631.]

But St. Augustine saith far otherwise: *Paulus modeste deterret a nuptiis, non tanquam a re mala, et illicita: sed tanquam ab onerosa et molesta. Aliud est enim admittere carnis turpitudinem, aliud habere carnis tribulationem. Illud est criminis facere: hoc laboris est pati*: "St. Paul in modest manner withdraweth men from marriage: not as from a thing evil and unlawful, but, as from a thing grievous and burthenous. For to commit the filthiness of the flesh, it is one thing: to have the trouble of the flesh, it is another thing. The one is to commit a fault, the other is to suffer a pain." Thus, by St. Augustine's judgment, marriage is not an evil or unlawful thing, but only a burthenous and a grievous thing.

Augustin. de
Sancta Vir-
ginitate, cap.
16. [vi. 347.]

But why should you thus defend an open error? This author, bearing the name of Chrysostom, saith, that the "copulation which is in marriage," notwithstanding it be no sin, yet "is an evil thing before God." Where did God himself ever so say in all the scriptures? where did the Holy Ghost ever say, that "wedlock is an evil thing?" Neither do I here mean the degree or state of wedlock, but the very fellowship and use of wedlock. Where did the Holy Ghost ever say hereof, "It is an evil thing before God?"

Heb. xiii. 4.

Verily St. Paul saith: "Marriage is honourable in all degrees, and a bed undefiled." The marriage bed, saith St. Paul, is no evil thing before God: "It is pure and holy, and undefiled." God himself ordained matrimony:

he ordaineth no ill. God himself commanded the *conjunctio* itself and use of matrimony: he commandeth no ill. "Unto the clean all things are clean." "He that bestoweth his virgin in marriage," saith St. Paul, "doth well." Tit. i. 15. 1 Cor. vii. 38. St. Paul saith not, "He doth evil before God:" but contrariwise, "He doth well." But how could he do well in giving her occasion to do ill? The holy father Paphnutius in the great council of Nice said thus: *Congressus cum legitima uxore, est castitas*: "The company of a man with his lawful wife, is chastity." Touching the disordered affections that may happen in the use of marriage, I will say nothing. If ye reason thus: "Such affections be ill: ergo, the use of marriage itself is ill:" ye fall into a foul error in arguing, called, as you know, *paralogismus accidentis*. St. Augustine saith: *Non, quia incontinentia malum est, ideo connubium, vel id, quo incontinentes copulantur, non est bonum*: "We may not say, because incontinency is an evil thing, therefore wedlock, or that copulation that is between" (man and wife), "that contain not, is no good thing." St. Augustine calleth the very copulation of man and wife, and the use of matrimony, a good thing, and that four times together in that same one place. How then can you say, that the same "copulation and use of matrimony, is an evil thing before God?" Beware, M. Harding, ye be not found in the company of them that say: "Good is evil, and evil is good." 

Isa. v. 20.

St. Hierom saith: *Si bonum est, mulierem non tangere, malum est ergo tangere. Nihil enim bono contrarium est, nisi malum*: "If it be good for a man not to touch his wife, then is it *evil to touch his wife*. For there is nothing contrary to good, but evil." Again he saith: *Quamdiu impleo mariti officium, non impleo Christiani* [al. *continentis*]: "As long as I do the duty of a husband, I do not the duty of a Christian man." Again: *Non negamus viduas, non negamus maritatas sanctas mulieres inveniri. Sed quæ uxores esse desierint: quæ in ipsa necessitate conjugii virginum imitentur castitatem*: "We deny not, but widows and married women may be holy: but such as have *left and forsaken wives' duties*, and in the very

Hieron. contra Jovinian. lib. i. [iv. pt. 2. 149.]

Ibidem. [p. 150.]

Hieron. contra Helvidium. [lv. pt. 2. 143.]

Sozom. lib. i. cap. 23. [ii. 41.]

Augustin. de Gen. ad Litter. lib. 9. cap. 7. [iii. 247.]

necessity of matrimony do counterfeit the chastity that is in maidens."

The like account we may make of sundry others : these few may suffice for this present.

Now touching the marriage of widowers and widows, a great many of the ancient fathers seem expressly and utterly to condemn it.

Athenagor.
in Apolog.
pro Christi-
anis. [ed.
Ben. p. 311.]

Athenagoras saith : *Secundæ nuptiæ decorum quoddam sunt adulterium* : "The second marriage" (of widowers or widows) "is a fair kind of advoutery." And St. Hierom

Hieron. ad
Gerontian.
[ad Ache-
ruch. iv. 744.]

calleth widows so married, "harlots and naughty women," *malas et prostitutas* : and saith : *Digamia.....non nascitur in terra bona* : "Second marriage groweth not in good

Hieron. con-
tra Jovinian.
lib. i. [iv. pt.
2. 159.]

soil." Again he saith : *Tolerabilius est, uni prostitutam esse, quam multis* : "More tolerable it is, to be concubine unto one, than unto many." Again : *Ubi numerus marito- rum est, ibi vir, qui proprie unus est, esse desiit* : "Whereas

In eodem.
libro. [ibid.
p. 160.]

there is a number of husbands, there the husband, that in proper speech is but one, is no husband." Likewise again : *Non damno digamos.....Etiam scortatorem recipio pœnitentem. Quicquid æqualiter licet, æqua lance pensandum est* : "I condemn not widowers or widows that have married again. No, I refuse not the fornicator upon his repentance. Whatsoever is equally lawful, must be weighed in one balance."

Nazianzen. in
dictum E-
vang. Cum
perfecisset
Jesus. [i.
650.]

Nazianzenus saith : *Hic sermo videtur mihi rejicere secundas nuptias. Si enim duo sunt Christi, duo item sunt mariti, et duæ uxores* : "This saying seemeth to condemn second marriage. For, if there be two Christs, then are

Origen. in
Lucan. hom.
17. [iii. 953.]

there two husbands and two wives." Origen saith : *Nunc et secundæ, et terciæ, et quartæ nuptiæ repetuntur : et non ignoramus, quod tale conjugium ejiciet nos de regno Dei* : "Now the second, and third, and fourth marriage is received. And we know, that such marriage shall cast us out of the kingdom of God."

By these few examples we may see, it was hard for these holy learned fathers, in so large amplifications of praising or dispraising, to hold measure. Yet, all these vehement words and amplifications notwithstanding, partly the same,

partly other the like holy and learned fathers, both used marriage themselves in their own persons, and also otherwise wrote and spake thereof with great reverence.

Tertullian, as St. Hierom witnesseth⁵⁶, was a married priest. Spiridion the bishop of Cyprus, sometime famous in the council of Nice, was married, and had children. So was St. Hilary the bishop of Poitiers, as appeareth by his epistle to his daughter Abra⁵⁷.

Hieron. de
Scriptor.
Eccel.
Sozom. lib. 1.
cap. 11.
[tom. ii. p.
22.]
Hilarius.

Addition.

Addition. ☞ “This authority of Hilary,” saith M. Harding, “is a simple rag, and a peevish apocryphal forged writ,” &c. *The answer.* It is even so indeed. I never took it to be otherwise. Neither do I allege it in such great sooth, as you imagine, but only as a pamphlet of your own. For, howsoever you weigh it now, they were your own friends that first forged this forgery: they were not of us. If you would shake off all such the like rags, that you and your fathers have patched up under the names of Anacletus, Athanasius, Amphilochius, and others, a great part of your books must needs go naked. But notwithstanding these writs be forged and full of fables, yet the fathers themselves, whose names they bear, in their own persons, were not forged. For Anacletus indeed was bishop of Rome: Athanasius indeed was bishop of Alexandria: Amphilochius indeed was bishop of Iconium. Even so, although this epistle, which some of you have forged under the name of St. Hilary, be a fable, yet St. Hilary indeed in his own person was a learned father and bishop of Poitiers in France, above eleven hundred years ago, and might indeed have a wife, and Abra indeed might be his daughter. And what marvel? For the priests in France lived still in wedlock until the time of pope Hildebrand, which was above seven hundred years after the death of St. Hilary. Verily Baptista Mantuanus witnesseth, that Hilarius in the time of his bishopric had a wife, and lived with her. ☞

[Detect.
285 a.]

Bapt. Man-
tuanus, in
Fastis.

⁵⁶ [This is more correctly stated in the Replie, supra vol. iii. 363. “Tertullian was a priest, as appeareth by St. Hierom, and married, as appeareth by his own book written to his wife.”]

⁵⁷ [Hilarius ad Abram. It is singular that the Bened. edd. admit this as genuine. Cave and Oudin reject it. See Replie, vol. iii. 363, note ⁶⁶.]

Niceph. lib.
11. cap. 19.

So was Gregory St. Basil's brother, the bishop of Nyssa. So was Gregory the bishop of Nazianzum, father unto Gregory Nazianzen, as appeareth by Ruffinus: yet was he nevertheless "a faithful servant, and a steward of the mysteries of God:" "a man of spiritual desires:" "the god of Pharaoh:" "the pillar and buttress of the church:" "and the star of the world." For in such wise his own son Gregory Nazianzen reporteth of him. Such a one was he, his wife and family notwithstanding. So was Prosper of Aquitania, the bishop of Rhegium, as it appeareth by his epigram written unto his wife: *Mearum comes irremota rerum.*

Nazian. in
laudem Pa-
tris. [l. 330.]
θεὸν Φαραῶ,
... στῦλον
καὶ ἐδραί-
ωμα τῆς ἐκ-
κλησίας, ...
καὶ φωστῆρα
ἐν κόσμῳ.

Prosper.

Χαυρήμων.

Euseb. lib.
6. cap. 41.
[l. 308.]

Euseb. lib.
5. cap. 25.
[l. 244.]

So was the holy father Chæremon the bishop of Nilus: who, as Eusebius writeth, was sent into banishment with his wife. So Polycrates, being likewise a bishop, sometime said, that seven of his fathers or ancestors had been bishops. The Greek word is *συγγενεῖς*. Ruffinus translateth it *parentes* [ed. 1567, *patres*].

[Detect.
285 b.]

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "The Greek word," you say, *Addition.* "is *συγγενεῖς*: and Ruffinus translateth it *parentes* [l. *patres*], &c. You mean not, I trow, that Polycrates had seven fathers. For that were too many by six, you know. One father is enough pardy for one man. What gather you hereof, that Polycrates was married, because he had seven ancestors?" *The answer.* You are a pleasant man, M. Harding: I see a little thing may make you merry. But, you say further: "I have belied Ruffinus. For he translateth not *συγγενεῖς*, *patres*, but *parentes*, which," you say, "goeth further off in signification than the word *patres* doth, as the learned in the civil laws do know." Indeed herein, I confess, there was an oversight. It is true Ruffinus hath not *patres*, but *parentes*. And yet where you say, "I bely Ruffinus," ye are over bitter. You know the difference between *patres* and *parentes* is not so great. For oftentimes in good signification both *patres* be *parentes*, and *parentes* be *patres*. Cicero joineth them in one, and saith, *pater parensque*, both together. You say: "This word *parentes* goeth further in signification than this word *patres*, as the learned in the civil law do know." I deny it not, M. Harding. But will you also say, that Ruffinus

was so curious in choice of words, or that he went to the civilians to learn Latin? Verily St. Hierom speaketh scornfully of him in that behalf, and thinketh him not able to speak good Latin⁵⁸. Howbeit, let us see what signification this word *parentes* beareth among the civilians. Thus therefore saith Caius one of the fathers of the law: *Appellatione parentis, non tantum pater, sed etiam avus, et proavus, et deinceps omnes superiores continentur: sed et mater et avia*: “Under this name *parens* is contained, not only father, grandfather, and great grandfather, and all other orderly going upward: but also mother and grandmother.” All these, saith Caius, are contained under this word *parens*. Now, M. Harding, for that it liketh you to make needless quarrels, and to play with words, I reckon ye will not say, that Polycrates’ mother, or grandmother, or great grandmother were bishops before him. For so, I trow, your learned civilians will not say. Then it resteth, that Polycrates said, his father, his grandfather, and his great grandfather, &c. were bishops, and that one of them had been father unto another. And this is all that I said. Therefore your mirth is at an end. ➡

Hieron. in Apologia adversus Rufinum. [iv. pt. 2. 443.]

Συγγραφεὺς ἀγράμματος.

De Verb. et Rerum significat. lib. 50.

Justinianus the emperor seemeth the more to esteem Epiphanius the bishop of Constantinople, for that his father, and other his ancestors, had been priests and bishops.

Novell. Constit. 3. §. finale. E. Græco.

Ignatius, St. John the Evangelist’s scholar, saith: “Peter and other the apostles of Christ were married men.” So writeth Clemens Alexandrinus. So writeth Eusebius. Origen saith (by the report of others his ancestors)⁵⁹: “That St. Paul and his wife were called to the faith both at one time.”

Ignatius ad Philadelphien. [Rus. sel. ii. 129.] Clemens Stromat. 3. [i. 535.]

Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 30. [i. 124.]

Origen. in Epist. ad Rom. cap. 1. lib. 1. [iv. 461.]

Philipp. iv. 3.

Addition. ➡ Of which wife, as he saith, he writeth thus in his epistle to the Philippians: *Rogo te germana compar, &c.*: “I beseech thee, faithful yoke-fellow, help those women that have laboured with me in the gospel.” ➡

St. Ambrose saith: *Omnes apostoli, excepto Johanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt*: “All the apostles had wives, only John and Paul excepted.”

Ambros. in 2 Cor. xl. [ii. app. 198.]

⁵⁸ [“Tantum habes Græci Latine sermonis scientiam, ut et Græci te Latinum, et Latini te

Græcum putent.”]

⁵⁹ [The words between brackets were not in the first edit., 1567.]

M. Harding,
fol. 286 a b.

Addition. ¶ Here saith M. Harding: "Whether is *Addition.*
truer man, M. Jewel that wrote the Reply, or M. Jewel
that wrote this pretended Defence? There he saith thus:
The twelve apostles, saith St. Ambrose, only St. John ex-
cepted, were all married⁵⁹; Here he saith otherwise: St.
Ambrose saith, All the apostles had wives, only St. John
and St. Paul excepted. Here St. Paul hath no wife: there
St. Paul hath a wife. If you were a true man there,
then are you false here. If you be true here, then were
you false there. Or he had a wife, or he had not. Say
which ye will: M. Jewel is contrary to M. Jewel. Fain
would I know which of these M. Jewels were to be trusted."

The answer. Here we have "M. Jewel in his Reply, and
M. Jewel in his Defence: M. Jewel contrary to M. Jewel:
true here, and false there: false here, and true there."
Oh, what a merry pang was this, M. Harding? Ye lacked
but somewhat to make yourself sport. St. Ambrose saith:
"The twelve apostles, only St. John excepted, were all
married." Again St. Ambrose saith: "All the apostles
had wives, only St. John and St. Paul excepted." I pray
you, good M. Harding, what contrariety find you in these
words? Do I make St. Ambrose first to say, "St. Paul had
a wife?" and do I make him afterward to say, "St. Paul had
no wife?" I trow ye were not well awaked. Ye laughed at
somewhat in your dream. You know, though St. Paul
were an apostle of Christ, yet was he none of the twelve
apostles. What, should you be told those things, that chil-
dren know? Ye much misreckon yourself. These sayings
may well stand together. "All the twelve apostles, John
only excepted, had wives." And yet St. Paul, being none
of the twelve, had no wife. What mean you then with
"this M. Jewel, and that M. Jewel: M. Jewel here, and
M. Jewel there?" Both here and there M. Jewel saith
truth. But both here and there you are one man still.
Why should you so vainly bestow your wits?

As touching St. Paul, Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius,
and Ignatius⁶⁰, that saw Christ after his resurrection, and

Ambros. in
2 Cor. xi. [ii.
app. 198.]

Ignatius ad
Philadel-
phien. [4. H.
129.]

⁵⁹ [See Replie, vol. iii. 363,
note ⁶⁴. This commentary on the
Epistles is not by St. Ambrose.]

⁶⁰ [Ignatii Ep. ad Philad. See
supra, vol. iii. p. 362, note ⁶³.
Bp. Jewel is quoting the *longer*

was in company with the apostles, say in plain words, "He had a wife." Of the other side, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Hierom, and others that lived well near four hundred years after Christ's ascension, say plainly, "He had no wife." Here have you doctors against doctors: three against three: and that namely touching the marriage of St. Paul. Will you therefore come in with these gewgaws, and tell us, "Fain would I know, which of these doctors were to be trusted?" Leave, leave this unseemly sporting, M. Harding. Ye wiss it becometh you not. There is nothing here worthy the laughing at, but only your folly. ☞

Clemens Alexandrinus saith: *Perfecti Christiani edunt, bibunt, contrahunt matrimonium*: "They that be perfect Christian men do eat and drink, and contract matrimony⁶¹." St. Hierom, writing against Jovinian, saith thus: *Quasi non hodie quoque plurimi sacerdotes habeant matrimonia*: "As though nowadays very many priests were not married." And therefore he saith, as he is alleged by Gratian: *Legant episcopi et presbyteri, qui filios suos sæcularibus literis erudiunt*: "Let bishops and priests read these things, that bring up their children in worldly learning," (and not in the scriptures of God.)

Pope Damasus (and others have)⁶² shewed us, that a "great number of bishops of Rome" were priests' sons: as pope Sylverius: pope Deusdedit: (pope Adrianus II:) (pope John XV:) pope Felix III: pope Hosius: pope Agapetus: pope Gelasius: pope Bonifacius: (pope John X:) pope Theodorus⁶³ And concludeth thus: *Complures etiam alii inveniuntur, qui de sacerdotibus nati, apostolicæ sedi præfuerunt*: "Many others beside there are found, that being priests' sons, ruled the apostolic see of Rome."

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "What shall I say unto this fellow? who ever saw so impudent a man? doth pope Damasus shew you all this, M. Jewel? Fie for shame, man. You a minister of God's word? Nay, a minister of vain

Epistles, the genuineness of which has been defended by Beveridge.]

⁶¹ [Clem. Strom. 7. ὁ τέλειος δὲ . . . καὶ ἐσθίει, καὶ πίνει, καὶ γαμέει. . . .]

⁶² [The words between brackets were added in the edit. of 1570.]

⁶³ [The names between brackets are not found in Gratian.]

Clemens.
Strom. lib.
7. [il. 874.]

Hieron. ad-
vers. Jovi-
nian. lib. 1.
[iv. pt. 2.
165.]

Dist. 37.
Legent.

Dist. 56.
Hosius.

M. Harding,
fol. 287 a.

fables, and a minister of open lies. What may we call this in you? foolish ignorance, or shameless malice? how could you be so ignorant, or so witless, as once to dream that Damasus, that learned pope, should thus write? that you might seem a jolly proctor for your brothers, the married apostates' sacrilegious, incestuous, and abominable yoking, must Damasus needs be made a prophet?... Consider, reader, I pray thee, (for it booteth not to tell it M. Jewel,) how this tale hangeth together. Damasus was the thirtieth pope: Sylverius was the sixtieth pope: Deusdedit was the seventieth pope: Adrianus II. was the hundred and ninth pope, &c. What a marvellous prophet then was M. Jewel's Damasus, that could thus prophesy of so many popes so long to come after his death? As for pope Hosius, he is a pope of M. Jewel's own making. In the registers of the popes I find none so named. Gratian hath not so many popes by three. For he nameth not John X. nor John XV. nor Adrian II." &c. *The answer.* What mean these terrible exclamations, M. Harding? You cry out, "vain," "foolish," "ignorant," "witless," "impudent," "shameless," "sacrilegious," "incestuous," "abominable yoking." Who hath thus offended you? what wise man would be so vehement without some cause? It were much better for you to come again to yourself, and to learn to be sober. "Pope Damasus" (you say) "could not write of Sylverius, and Deusdedit, and Adrianus, and Felix, and others that were born so many years after his death." What then? will you therefore thus fondly fall out and rage with me? It is your own friend doctor Gratian, M. Harding, that thus hath written. I am the reporter only: I write it not. Call him "vain," "foolish," "ignorant," "witless," "impudent," "shameless," and what you list. Fall out rather with them that have called his books, "The foundation of the canon law." Fall out with pope Eugenius, that commended his books unto the world. As for me, I know what he is. I allege him as I find him. Compare my words with Gratian: you shall see I do right. Only I left out certain popes' names for shortness sake: which fault here for your pleasure I have reformed.

But you say: "Hosius is a pope of M. Jewel's own

Dist. 56.
Hosius.

Fundamen-
tum Juris
Canonici.

making: for in the register of popes ye find none so named." Yet if you had better conferred with Gratian, you should have found, that pope Hosius is the first in all the rank. How truly he is either so named, or so placed, I make none account. It is your own Gratian that so reporteth: and, as I have said before, it is the "ground and foundation of all your laws." "Pope Damasus" (you say) "could not write of those popes that so many hundred years followed after him." That, I grant you, is also an error. Bid your Gratian reform it. For his only error it is: it is none of ours. Howbeit, as for the truth of the matter itself, read the lives of all these popes: and ye shall find it true, that Gratian saith, that every of them had a priest to his father. For example, Platina saith, pope Sylverius was the son of bishop Hormisda: pope Boni-^{Platina in Sylverio, et in Bonif. I.} facius I. was the son of Jucundus a priest. And so the rest. Therefore, somewhat to relieve your Gratian's credit, notwithstanding he erred in the name of Damasus, yet in the true story of these popes and of their fathers, he erred nothing. For indeed all they whose names he rehearseth were priests' sons.

Further you say: "Gratian hath not so many popes' names by three, as I have reckoned. For he nameth not pope John X. nor pope John XV. nor pope Adrian II." This, I confess, was mine own oversight, in that I mingled these names with the rest, neither alleging nor noting mine author. Notwithstanding, this error proceeded only of negligence, and not of malice, as to any indifferent man it may soon appear. For touching the truth of the matter itself, Platina saith: "Every of these three popes had a priest to his father," as had the others whom we have named. These be his words: "Pope John the Eleventh" (which in other computations is reckoned the Tenth) "was son unto pope Sergius: pope John the Sixteenth" (who of some others is counted the Fifteenth) "was son to a priest called Leo: pope Adrian the Second was the son of a bishop named Taralus." Here ye have your whole reckoning, M. Harding, and no cause why ye should be further offended.

But you tell your reader: "That this authority is

^{M. Harding, fol. 287 b.}

brought in by Gratian under the name of Palea: and that Palea is as much to say as *chaff*, and signifieth, that all that followeth is little worth. Such chaff" (say you) "is M. Jewel driven to take hold at, to maintain his brothers' filthiness, for lack of better stuff." And is it true, M. Harding, that all that Gratian layeth out under the name of Palea, is nothing else but "chaff, and vain stuff of little worth?" what will you then do with your great Donation of Constantine, whereby the pope claimeth his jurisdiction over the other three patriarchs, his whole triple crown, and the whole empire of the west? shall this also go for "chaff, and forgery, and vain stuff?" do you not know that the said Donation is entituled Palea, as well as this? will you for the safeguard of your priests' children, leave the pope with all his universal power and authority in the chaff? Thus you use your authors and doctors, M. Harding; sometimes they are "chaff:" sometimes they are "corn:" sometimes they are "dross:" sometimes they are "gold."

Here you have the whole matter truly proved: all these popes, by your Gratian alleged, found priests' sons: the other three popes with the priests their fathers fully avouched: your vain "chaff" blown into the wind: and your Gratian's errors, touching the names of Damasus and Hosius, sufficiently answered. Leave therefore your ordinary talk of "foolish," "witless," "impudent," and "shameless men," M. Harding, lest your reader happen to open his eyes, and espy whose dealing is impudent. ➡

Pope Pius saith: "A married man, having his wife alive, may be chosen pope." His words be these: *Cur enim disputant doctores, An electus in papam uxori suæ debitum solvere teneatur*, &c.: "For wherefore do the canonists move this doubt, Whether a man being chosen pope be bound to yield marriage duty to his wife, unless a married man may be chosen to that room?" Polydorus Virgilius saith, that the "restraint of priests' marriage" was first attempted in England, about the year of our Lord "nine hundred threescore and ten:" and "that the same was afterward concluded in the west church, about the year of our Lord "a thousand and a hundred," and never before.

Distinct. 96.
Constanti-
nus.

Æneas Sylv.
De gestis
Concil. Basl.
lib. 2. [p.
59 b.]

Polydorus in
Hist. Anglor.
lib. 6. ann.
Dom. 970.
a Polydorus
de Invento-
ribus Rerum,
lib. 5. [cap.
4.] ann. Dom.
1100.

Fabian saith, that "bishops and priests lived a thousand years together with their wives, no law being to the contrary ^{Fabyan, p. 293.} 63."

These two principles being thus laid, the one of immoderate and extraordinary speech of the holy fathers, the other of the continual and ordinary practice of the church, we may now be the better able to consider the substance of M. Harding's reasons.

Addition.

Addition. ¶ M. Harding. "What, will M. Jewel make this fond and childish argument: Certain fathers spake over vehemently concerning matrimony: *item*, some of them were called to dignity of bishops from the state of married men: *ergo*, priests, monks, friars, nuns, who have vowed chastity, may lawfully marry wives, and take husbands?... Of what small substance this reason is, the veriest cobblers of all their ministers, if they can read any English besides their communion book, may easily perceive." *The answer.* Cobblers we have none in the holy ministry, M. Harding. And yet if we had any such, I see no cause but they might do God better service in his church than many that have been, and yet are priests and cardinals in the church of Rome. And what great wonder were it, if a good simple godly man were made a priest? You may remember that Julius the Second, a man utterly void both of learning and virtue, from a wherry-slave, not long sithence, became a pope. Verily St. Chrysostom is not ashamed oftentimes to call St. Paul *sutorem pellium*, which words you may English, "a clouter of skins," or, "a cobbler." But to leave these your vain and needless quarrels, there is no cobbler so simple, but it pitieth him to see you in so weighty matters to shew such folly.

Erasm. in Proverbio, A remo ad tribunal.

Chrysost. in 2. ad Tim. hom. 5. [xi. 687.]

The childish arguments that you have imagined are your own, M. Harding: you know full well they are none of mine. Thus only I say: "Divers the holy fathers have written over basely, I will not say vilely and slanderously, of the state of matrimony in general, calling it, in all kind of men, *fornication*: an ill thing, and like to advoutery:

63 [The Editor has not been able to find the edition of Fabyan's Chronicle, indicated in the margin.]

therefore, I say, they may much less be taken as indifferent judges in priests' marriage." Again: "Divers the holy fathers, being themselves priests and bishops, had wives, and lived in matrimony: therefore, I say, they condemned not priests' marriage." 

First of all, his objection of vows nothing toucheth the clergy of England. For it is known and confessed, that the priests of England were never votaries.

M. Harding,
fol. 290 b.

Addition.  Further, where I say: "The clergy of England was never bound to such vow of chastity," you say, "What moveth you to say, The priests of England are no votaries? what privilege have they above all other priests of Christendom, at least of the Latin and west church?" &c. *The answer.* You know, M. Harding, neither the priests of England ever offered any such vow, nor the bishop ever required it⁶⁴. And how can he be a votary, that maketh no vow? or how can there be a vow, where nothing is vowed?

M. Harding,
fol. 291 a.
291 b.

You say: "This vow is annexed to holy orders by statute of holy church: and bishops, priests, and deacons be tied to chastity." To "chastity" say you, M. Harding? Would God it were so. Would God the world saw not the contrary. Howbeit, here you allege pope Gregory, the emperor Justinian, the council of Carthage, pope Leo, and others. Yea, although the bishop require nothing, and although the priest promise nothing, "Yet," you say, "oaths and promises may lawfully pass without words." And here you bring in many proper things, of "laying hands on a book," of "holding up two fingers," of "sol-

M. Harding,
fol. 293 a.

⁶⁴ [This is not strictly accurate. In the Synod of Winchester, A.D. 1076, (shortly after Gregory VII.'s decree at Rome,) it was decreed that no one should be ordained deacon or priest without making the following declaration to the bishop: "Ego Frater N. promitto "Deo omnibusque sanctis ejus, castitatem corporis mei secundum "canonum decreta et secundum "ordinem mihi imponendum servare, domino præsule N. præsente;" Spelm. Concil. vol. ii.

p. 11. ap. Collier. This declaration was gradually discontinued. Bp. Jewel is speaking of his own time, and his own experience as a priest; and Harding, also an English priest, expressly admits (Detect. 292 b.) that no promise was given or required at ordination. The same Synod proves decisively, that the clergy in England were, up to the year 1076, allowed to marry, and that, in defiance of Gregory's cruel decree, those already married were not compelled to leave their wives.]

diers' badges," and I wot not what. In the end you conclude, "a beck is as good as a Dieu garde." All these words, ^{M. Harding, 293, b.} M. Harding, are not worth one word of answer.

If the priests of England were always votaries, and have so continued from the beginning, how is it then, that the same priests nevertheless continued still in lawful matrimony, for the space of more than a thousand years together after Christ, and that without reproof, and without offence of the church of God? Were they all bound by vow to live single? and yet did they altogether, all that while, contrary to their solemn vow, live lawfully in open wedlock? who would thus say but M. Harding? where then was the pope, that should have deprived them? where was then M. Harding, that should have cried out upon them, "fleshly," "incestuous," "sacrilegious vow-breakers?" was incest and sacrilege so lightly weighed among our fathers so long a time? was there neither bishop, nor priest, nor other holy man within this realm, during the space of so many hundred years, that would reprove it? did all the godly priests of this realm make solemn vows for no other cause, but only to break them? Let us think better of our fathers, M. Harding. Certainly they made no such vow, neither by "beck," as you say, nor by "Dieu garde."

Again: "If the vow of chastity be of itself annexed to orders," as you say, what shall we then think of the priests of Græcia, and Asia, and of all other christened countries through the world? are they all bound to chastity by solemn vow, and yet live they all in open matrimony against their vow? are they all "fleshly," "incestuous," "sacrilegious vow-breakers," without exception? Wherefore then doth pope Stephanus say: *Aliter se orientalium traditio habet ecclesiarum, aliter hujus sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ. Nam illarum sacerdotes, diaconi, et subdiaconi matrimonio copulantur?* ^{Dist. 31. Aliter.} "The tradition of the east church is one, and the tradition of this holy church of Rome is another. For the priests, deacons, and sub-deacons of the east church are joined in matrimony?" wherefore is it noted there in the rubric: *Orientalis ecclesia votum castitatis non*

obtulit? “The east church hath not offered the vow of chastity?” wherefore do you yourself, M. Harding, secretly confess, that the priests of the east church are no votaries?

M. Harding,
fol. 290 b.

Remember your words: thus you say: “What privilege have the priests of England above all other priests of Christendom, at least of the Latin and west church?” you say: you dare not say, the east church was ever subject to any such vow. Wherefore doth cardinal Cajetan say: *Nec ordo, in quantum ordo, nec ordo, in quantum sacer, est impeditivus matrimonii*? “Neither the order of priesthood, in that it is an order, nor the same order, in that it is holy, is any hinderance to matrimony?” Neither pope Stephanus, nor Gratian, nor cardinal Cajetan, nor you yourself might thus have written, if the vow of chastity were necessarily annexed to holy orders.

Cardinal.
Cajetan. in
Quodlibetis.
[tom. 1. de
Collat. Ord.
fol. 61. col.
2.]

M. Harding,
292 a.

You allege a canon of the council of Ancyra, where, you say, “It is thus decreed touching deacons: ‘If a deacon receive order of a bishop, and hold his peace, it shall not be lawful afterward for him to marry.’” By this canon you teach us, that the vow of chastity is evermore joined with holy orders. But in the same canon it is also decreed: “That if the deacon make protestation, and tell the bishop that he will marry, for that he is not able to live single, then, if he afterward marry, he shall still continue in the ministry.” All this, I say, is written in the same canon: I say not in any other, but in the same. Ye would not thus have beguiled your reader, if ye had meant plainly. Notwithstanding, I will not here touch your credit, M. Harding, nor use your ordinary exclamations of “Falsehood” and “Forgery.” Yet here you see in this case, the *council thought it lawful for a deacon to marry, notwithstanding he were in holy orders*. And thus it is plain by the same canon ye have here alleged, *That then your vow was not annexed to holy orders*.

Concil. An-
cyr. cap. 10.
[il. §17.]

M. Harding,
292 a.

Further you say: “Origen, whom I may well allege for witness of the church of his time, saith, That none may offer the continual sacrifice, but such only as have vowed continual chastity.” *The answer*. By the “continual sacrifice” you would bear us in hand, that Origen meant

only that "sacrifice" that you have imagined in your "mass." But indeed, M. Harding, Origen in that place Origen, in Numer. hom. 23. [il. 358.] speaketh not one word, neither of your "mass," (for he never knew it: he would have abhorred it,) nor of your imagined "sacrifice," nor of "priest," nor of "deacon," nor of any outward ministry of the church. If it be otherwise, for your credit's sake, let the words appear. If there be in Origen not one such word, no not one, what opinion may your friends have in your dealing, whom they see so slily to juggle before their eyes? Verily, Origen by the "continual sacrifice" meant none other but only the "sacrifice" of faithful prayer: which "sacrifice" also thus many ways he expresseth: *Si sine intermissione*, &c.: "If we *pray* without ceasing. If our *prayer* early in the morning rise up as a pleasant perfume in the sight of God. If the lifting up of our hands be unto him an evening sacrifice." This is the "sacrifice" that Origen there speaketh of, M. Harding. Of any other your "sacrifice" he speaketh nothing. Of this sacrifice he saith, "No man can offer it, that liveth in wedlock." And thus he saith, not only of priests and deacons, as you seem to tell us, but generally of every of God's faithful people. "No man," saith he, "can offer up this continual *sacrifice* of *prayer*, unless he continue in chastity, and live a virgin." And this, M. Harding, was not the general order of the church in that time, as you report it, but one of Origen's particular and known errors.

Thus you have proved: "that your vow was annexed to holy orders," by the authority of him, that speaketh not one word, neither of "priest," nor of "deacon," nor of any other ecclesiastical order: but generally of all faithful Christian people: and of the particular error of one man ye have framed a general order of the church. ➡

Yet for further answer, we grant, it is reason and convenient, that whoso hath made a vow unto God should keep his promise. Cyrillus saith: *Si castitatem promiserit, et servare non poterit, pronuntiet peccatum suum*: "If he Cyrl. in Leviticum, lib. 3. [ed. Basil. 1546, tom. 1. 647.] have promised or vowed chastity, and *cannot keep it*, let him pronounce and confess his sin."

M. Harding,
fol. 290 a.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “As for the saying you *Addition.* allege out of the third book of Cyrillus in *Leviticum*, it can serve you to no purpose, but to witness your forgery and falsehood. For there is no such saying in that book.” *The answer.* O, M. Harding, why should you take so vain pleasure in evil speech? Is there no such saying in all that book? what book had you to seek in? or what spectacles had you to behold it? Your manner is to pronounce overboldly, before you know. I grant, I have not alleged all the words, that St. Cyril useth. Otherwise I should have taken out of him more than thirty lines altogether. Notwithstanding I have neither forged, nor altered, nor devised any manner thing of myself, as it shall appear.

Cyrl. in *Leviticum*, lib. 3. [ed. Basil. i. 646.]

First St. Cyril saith thus: *Nos, cum venimus ad Dominum, et vovemus nos ei in castitate (velle) servire, pronuntiamus labiis nostris, et juramus nos (velle) castigare carnem nostram, &c.*: “When we come to our Lord, and make a vow, that we will serve him in chastity, we pronounce with our lips, and make an oath, that we will chasten our flesh,” &c. Here have we by express words a “vow,” and a “vow of chastity.” After certain lines it followeth thus: *Si istum ordinem promiseris, et servare non quiveris, audi [al. aut] quid legis ordo præcipiat: Si peccaverit, inquit, unum aliquod de istis, pronuntiet peccatum (suum) quod peccavit*: “If thou have promised to keep this order, and canst not keep it, hear what the order of the law commandeth thee. Thus saith the law, If a man shall offend in any of these things, let him pronounce the sin that he hath sinned.” Here you may not say, M. Harding, that these latter words were uttered upon occasion of some other matter that went between. For St Cyril spake these selfsame words namely and only of him that hath “vowed and sworn chastity.” “We make a vow,” saith Cyril, “to serve God in chaste life: we pronounce it, and give it out from our lips: we swear, that we will chasten our flesh.” Yet, saith he: “If thou have promised to keep this order, and canst not keep it, pronounce thy sin that thou hast sinned.” These, M. Harding, be the words that you say cannot be found in St. Cyril. This is my falsehood: this

[Ibidem, p. 647.]

is my forgery. You see, your over hasty judgment may soon deceive you. ➡

Howbeit, touching virginity or chastity, we say, It standeth not in our choice or "vow," but in the singular gift of God. Christ himself saith: "All men take not this word, but they unto whom it is given." Matt. xix. 11. Justinus Martyr saith: *Multi castraverunt se propter regnum cælorum.* Justinus Apologia 2. [p. 52.] *Verum hoc non cuivis datum est:* "Many have gelded themselves for the kingdom of heaven. But this thing is not given to all men." St. Ambrose saith: *Sola virginitas est quæ suaderi potest, imperari non potest:* "Only virginity is a thing that may be counselled: but commanded it may not be." So St. Hierom: *Unde infert Dominus, Qui potest capere, capiat: ut unusquisque consideret vires suas: utrum possit virginalia et pudiciticæ præcepta implere: per se enim castitas blanda est, et quemlibet ad se alliciens. Sed considerandæ sunt vires: ut qui potest capere, capiat:* "Our Lord addeth, 'He that can take, let him take:' that every man may consider his own strength, whether he be able to accomplish the laws of virginity and chastity or no. For chastity of itself is fair, and pleasant, and able to allure any man unto itself. But we must weigh our ability, that he may take it, that can take it."

Hereof the ancient father Origen began to complain so long ago in his time: *Non solum, quæ docent, non faciunt, sed etiam crudeliter, et sine misericordia injungunt aliis majora virtute ipsorum, non habentes rationem virium uniuscujusque: ut, qui prohibent nubere, et ab eo quod expedit, ad immoderatam munditiem compellunt:* "Not only they do not that they teach, but also cruelly and without mercy they command others to do that they be not able, not considering or weighing each man's strength. Such be they, that forbid men to marry, and from that thing that is lawful, drive and force men to an immoderate kind of cleanliness."

St. Hierom saith: *Si quis consideret virginem suam, id est, carnem suam lascivire, et ebullire in libidinem, nec refrænare se potest, duplex [leg. duplexque] illi incumbit necessitas, aut capiendæ conjugis, aut ruendi..... [Ben. ed. spernendæ]:* "If any man consider that his own virgin, Hieron. contra Jovinian. lib. 1. [iv. pt. 2. 158.]

that is to say, his own flesh, groweth proud, and boileth unto lust, *and cannot stay it, there is laid upon him a double necessity, either to take a wife, or else to fall*⁶³.”

C ril. in Le-
vlt. lib. 16.

In this case St. Cyril saith : *Oportet compati, et commetiri doctrinam pro virium qualitate : et hujusmodi, qui non possunt capere sermonem de castitate, concedere nuptias* : “ We must have consideration of men, and measure our doctrine according to every man’s ability : and unto such men as cannot take the word of chastity, we ought to grant marriage⁶⁴.”

22. Quest. 4.
In malis.

If M. Harding will reply, that this counsel may take place in all others, but not in them that have vowed or promised the contrary, let him understand his own rule written in the popes’ own decrees : *In malis promissis rescinde fidem : in turpi voto muta decretum : quod incaute voristi, ne facias : impia est promissio, quæ scelere impletur* : “ In an evil promise, break thy faith : in an honest vow, change thy purpose : that thou hast unadvisedly vowed, see thou do it not : it is an evil promise, that is kept with wickedness.”

M. Harding,
fol. 296 a.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “ What relief bringeth all this unto his cause, unless he be able to prove, that chastity is an ill and a wicked thing?” *The answer.* No, M. Harding, chastity is no ill thing : it is the special gift of God. But an unclean and a filthy life under colour of a “vow,” or the name of “chastity,” is a wicked thing before God. You know it is commonly said under the name of St. Hierom : *Simulata sanctitas duplex est iniquitas* : “ Counterfeit holiness is double wickedness.” ☞

Cyprian. lib.
1. epist. 11.
[p. 102.]

St. Cyprian, having occasion to write of certain maids, that had vowed virginity and lived in disorder, saith thus : *Quod si perseverare nolunt, vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, quam ut in ignem deliciis [al. delictis] suis cadant. Certe nullum fratribus, aut sororibus scandalum faciant* : “ If they either cannot, or will not continue in chastity,

⁶³ [The Author has not given this quotation accurately. The force of the particle “si” is carried on by “duplexque,” and after “ruendi” (which should be read “spernendæ”) these words should

follow, “quod vult, faciat : non peccat si nubat.”]

⁶⁴ [The Editor has not succeeded in verifying the quotations from St. Cyrill in Levit. in the Greek.]

better it is for them to marry, than to fall into the fire” (of hell) “with their pleasures. At the least, let them breed no slander to their brothers or sisters.”

St. Augustine saith: *Quidam nubentes post votum, asserunt adulteros esse. Ego autem dico vobis, quod graviter peccant, qui tales dividunt*: “Some men there be that say, They be advouterers, that marry after that they have made a vow. But I tell you, *that they sin grievously, that put such asunder.*”

Augustin. de Bono Conjugal. Dist. 27. Quidam.

Epiphanius likewise saith: *Melius est, unum habere peccatum, quam multa. Melius est cadentem a studio, aperte sibi uxorem asciscere secundum leges, &c. Et a virginitate longo tempore agere pœnitentiam, &c. Et non quotidie occultis jaculis vulnerari*: “Better it is to have one sin, than many sins. Better it is for a man falling from his course, *openly to take unto him a wife, according to the law, &c.* and a long time to repent himself of the breach of his virginity, &c.: and not to be wounded with privy darts every day.”

Epiphanius contra Hæres. 61. Apostolic. lib. 2. [l. 512.] φανερώς ἐαυτῷ λαβεῖν γυναῖκα κατὰ νόμον.

St. Hieron saith: *Sanctum virginum propositum, et cœlestis angelorumque familiæ gloriam quarundam non bene se agentium nomen infamat. Quibus aperte dicendum est, ut aut nubant, si se non possunt continere: aut contineant, si nolunt nubere*: “The name of certain virgins not well behaving themselves, defameth and shameth the holy purpose of virgins, and the glory of the heavenly and angelical family. Whom we must plainly charge, that *either they marry, if they cannot contain: or that they contain, if they will not marry.*”

Hieron. ad Virginem Demetriadem. [iv. pt. 2. 796.]

To like purpose St. Augustine saith: *Multas earum revocat a nubendo, non amor præclari propositi, sed aperti dedecoris timor, veniens et ipse a superbia: qua formidatur hominibus magis displicere, quam Deo. Nubere nolunt* [Ben. ed. volunt]: *et ideo non nubunt, quia impune non possunt: quæ melius nuberent, quam urerentur, id est, quam occulta flamma concupiscentiæ in ipsa conscientia vastarentur: quas pœnitet professionis, et piget confessionis*: “Many of them are kept from marriage, not for love of their goodly purpose of virginity, but for fear of open shame, which shame also proceedeth of pride, for that *they*

Augustin. de Sancta Virginitate. cap. 34. [vi. 357.]

are more afraid to displease man than God. They will not marry: and therefore they marry not, because they cannot without rebuke. Yet better were it for them to marry, than to burn, that is to say, than with the flame of their concupiscence in their own conscience to be wasted. They are sorry of their profession, and yet it grieveth them to confess," &c.

It is not sufficient to say: "I have vowed." Herod Mark vi. 23. "vowed" John Baptist's head: the Jews "vowed" St. Acts xxiii. 12. Paul's death. Hubaldus, as it is noted by Gratian in the 22. Quest. 4. Decrees, made a "vow" that he would never help his own mother or brethren, were their need never so great.

Alphonsus Virvesius, one of M. Harding's greatest doctors, saith thus: *Si quis voverit, et continere non possit, et omnia expertus, nihil promoverit, ego illi author essem, non ut proprio consilio, sed ut autoritate pontificis saluti suæ consulat per matrimonium*: "If any man have vowed, and cannot contain, and having assayed all means yet be never the neare, I would advise him, that he should provide for the safety of his soul by marriage: and yet not of his own counsel, but by license and authority of the pope."

Likewise Thomas of Aquine saith: *Potest contingere, quod in aliquo casu sit, vel simpliciter malum, vel inutile, vel majoris boni impeditivum.....Et ideo necesse est, quod determinetur, in tali casu, votum non esse servandum*: "It may happen, that in some case a vow may be either utterly ill, or unprofitable, or an hinderance unto some other good thing of more weight. And therefore it must of necessity be determined, that in such a case, a vow ought not to be kept." Therefore it was thus decreed in the council of Toledo: *Non est servandum sacramentum, quod male et incaute promittitur*: "A vow ill and unadvisedly promised ought not to be kept."

M. Harding, 294 a. Addition. ¶ M. Harding. "Here M. Jewel allegeth Addition. the sayings of sundry holy fathers, counselling those that either cannot, or will not, keep chastity, to take the remedy that God hath ordained, that is to say, to marry. Which counsel is understood to be given unto them, that have made no vow at all to the contrary." *The answer.* How

then, M. Harding, if you be not able to keep chastity? is your vow sufficient to make you able? or will you keep your vow and live in filthiness? or, if you so live, shall you be excused by your vow? St. Paul saith: "Fornicators [Heb. xiii. 4.] and advouterers the Lord will judge:" they "shall have no [Eph. v. 5.] part in the kingdom of Christ and God." Woe be to that vow, that worketh the destruction of the soul.

"But," you say, "this counsel is given to them that M. Harding, 294 a. have made no vow." Thus you say, and yet you know, you say untruly. Behold the authorities: the words be plain: the holy fathers spake expressly of them, that have vowed. Let St. Cyprian be an example for the rest. Thus he saith: *Quod si se ex fide Christo dicaverunt, pudice, et caste sine ulla fabula perseverent, &c. Sin autem persevere nolunt, vel non possunt, melius est ut nubant, &c.* Cyprian. lib. 1. epist. 17. [p. 102.] "If they have in faith vowed themselves to Christ, let them continue chastely and honestly without guile, &c. But, if they will not or cannot continue, better it is for them to marry, than with their pleasures to fall into the fire of hell." Behold, M. Harding, St. Cyprian speaketh namely of them, "that have vowed themselves to Christ." Unto them he directeth his counsel: of such he saith: "It is better for them to marry."

You say: "St. Cyprian speaketh of them that have made no vows:" St. Cyprian himself saith: "He speaketh of them that have made a vow." And must we believe you before St. Cyprian? Why should you with such untruths and vanities deceive the world?

Yet, notwithstanding, you tell us, contrary to all that St. Cyprian hath taught you: "If a man have once made a vow, though he be not able to live chaste, yet he may in no wise marry:" that is to say, he must live in fornication or other filthiness. St. Paul saith: "If they live not chastely, let them marry: better it is to marry, than to burn." But by your advice, we must take St. Paul's words, and turn them backward, and say thus: "Marry not, though you live unchastely: better it is to burn in concupiscence, than to marry." 

Here, M. Harding, ye cry out in your inordinate heat:

“Fleshly gospellers,” “evangelical vowbreakers,” “impure bigamy,” “filthy railing rabble,” “lordaines,” “strumpets,” and I wot not what: as if this were the only way to win the victory. Unto this kind of eloquence I will make you none other answer, than that Demetrius sometime made unto Lysimachus: *Scortum apud nos modestius vivit quam apud vos Penelope*: one of these whom it liketh you to call “strumpets, liveth more soberly amongst us, than doth amongst you your chaste Penelope.”

It appeareth by St. Augustine, M. Harding, that your error is ancient, and began long ago. For he saith, that even then in his time there were some that maintained the same. But he answered them then, as we do you now: “They spake fondly and unadvisedly, and understood not what they said.” His words be these: *Qui dicunt, talium nuptias non esse nuptias, sed potius adulteria, mihi non videntur satis acute, ac diligenter considerare quid dicant*: “They that say, *The marriage of such men or women*” (as have vowed chastity) “*is no marriage*, but rather advoutery, seem unto me not to consider discreetly and wisely what they say.” And again: *Fit per hanc minus consideratam opinionem....., ut, cum volunt eas separatas reddere continentiae, faciant maritos earum adulteros veros, cum, suis uxoribus vivis, alteras duxerint*: “It cometh to pass by this unadvised opinion, that, whereas they will remove these women that so have vowed from their husbands, and force them to continue in their single life, they make the husbands of them *advouterers indeed*, in case they marry again, their own wives being still alive.”

Thus therefore, M. Harding, you may imagine, St. Augustine saith unto you, as he did unto them: “Ye speak fondly and unadvisedly, and understand not what ye speak.”

And yet one of your companions there telleth us: “That he is undoubtedly the devil’s minister, that will say,” (as St. Augustine saith,) “that the marriage of such persons is true and very marriage.” Thus, by the judgment of your late Louvanian clergy, St. Augustine is become the minister of the devil.

Augustin. de
Bono Vidui-
tatis, cap. 10.
[vi. 375.]

In eodem.
Capite. [p.
376.]

Dorman.
fol. 16.

But M. Harding hath further to say, that St. Augustine called this kind of marriage “worse than advoutery:” another calleth it “incest:” and another “sacrilege.” That the ancient fathers have thus written, it is true, and not denied. Howbeit, good reader, as I have partly shewed before, these and other like words have proceeded, more of zeal and heat of mind, than of profound consideration and judgment of the cause. Neither may we always strain such sayings to the uttermost. For, whereas St. Augustine saith, “Such marriage is worse than advoutery,” he saith nevertheless immediately after in the same place: “It is true and very marriage indeed before God and man, and no advoutery.” His words be these:

Non quod ipsæ nuptiæ vel talium damnandæ judicentur. Damnatur propositi fraus: damnatur fracta voti fides, &c. Damnantur tales, non quia conjugalem fidem posterius iniierunt, sed quia continentiæ primam fidem irritam fecerunt:

Augustin, de
Bono Vidul-
tatis, cap. 9.
[vi. 375.]

“Not that the marriage of such persons is to be blamed: the defrauding of their purpose, and the breach of their vow, is blamed. Such are blamed, *not for that they have entered into the faith of matrimony*, but for that they have broken their first faith, or promise of continent life.” So likewise St. Augustine saith of a woman that used to paint her face: *Etsi impudica circa homines.....non sis, tamen corruptis, violatisque, quæ Dei sunt, pejor adultera detineris:*

Augustin, de
Doctrina
Christianæ,
lib. 4. cap. 21.
[lib. 85.]

“Although thou be no evil woman, as touching men, or the misusing of thy body, yet thus colouring and corrupting thy face, which thou hast of God, *thou art worse than an advouteress*⁶⁴.” Here by way of comparison, and in heat of speech, St. Augustine saith: “The painting of the face is worse than advoutery.” In like sense St. Cyprian saith: *Diabolo pejor est, qui fæminarum aspectibus feritur:*

Cyprian, de
Singular.
Clericorum,
[app. clxxiii.]
Cyprian, lib.
4. eplst. 2.
[p. 74.]

“He that is stricken or moved with the sight of woman is *worse than the devil*⁶⁵.” Likewise again he saith: *Multo gravior et pejor est mæchi causa, quam libellatici:* “An

⁶⁴ [These words are St. Ambrose's quoted by St. Augustine.] Clericorum,” is not by St. Cyprian.]

⁶⁵ [The work “De Singularitate

advouterer's case is worse than is the case of him that hath betrayed the faith."

Such comparisons, as I have said, may not well be racked to all purposes, but must be taken so far forth only as they were meant. Otherwise the same St. Cyprian saith : *Pejus est, quam mæchari* [Ben. ed. *mæchia*], *continentiam ducere criminosam* : "To live unchastely under the colour of chaste life," (as your clergy doth,) "is *worse than advoutery*." Here, M. Harding, St. Cyprian saith, that your unchaste chastity, and coloured vaunt of virginity, is "worse than advoutery."

Cyprian, de
Singularitate
Clericorum,
[app. clixvii.]

So St. Ambrose when he had said : "If she have a mind to marry, she committeth advoutery, she is made the handmaid of death:" he addeth further, as of a greater evil : *Si hoc ita est, quid de illa dicendum est, quæ occulta, et furtiva turpitudine constupratur, et fingit se esse, quod non est ? Bis adultera est* : "This being so, *what then shall we say of her*, that is defiled with secret and privy filthiness, and feigneth herself to be that indeed she is not ? *She is twice an advouteress*."

Ambros. ad
Virginem
Lapsam, cap.
5. [il. 310.]

Chrysostom.
tom. 5. Quod
regulares fœ-
minæ cum
viris coha-
bitent, [i.
254.]

Here St. Ambrose calleth your "painted virginity, *double advoutery*." So St. Chrysostom : *Virginitas ista cum viris plus ab omnibus arguitur, quam stuprum ipsum* : "This virginity of women amongst men is *more reprovèd of all men than fornication itself*."

By these few we may the better understand the place that M. Harding hath here alleged of St. Paul unto Timothy : "When they wax wanton against Christ, they will marry, having damnation, because they have broken their first faith." Notwithstanding indeed St. Paul spake these words neither of vows nor of vowbreakers : but of the widows, that were appointed to attend upon the old and sick persons, and therefore were relieved and found by the church.

1 Tim. v. 11.

But let us imagine, as M. Harding would have us, that St. Paul spake all this of the breach of vows. And let *prima fides*, "the first faith," be the vow of chastity. Howbeit, indeed, our "first faith" is the faith that we

promise in baptism, and none other. And so St. Hierom seemeth to take it. For thus he writeth: *Non sunt digni fide, qui primam fidem irritam fecerunt: Marcionem loquor et Basilidem*: “They be not worthy to be believed that have forsaken their *first faith*: I mean Marcion and Basilides.” These two famous heretics, Marcion and Basilides, were not condemned for breaking any vow of chastity, but for refusing the faith of Christ, which St. Hierom called the “first faith.”

St. Paul maketh no mention of any vow, but only rebuketh such light and wavering women, as being of long time found by the charges of the congregation, purposely to relieve the sick and the feeble, afterward forsook both the congregation and Christ too, and became heathens, and followed the devil. For so St. Paul saith: *Nonnullæ jam deflexerunt post Satanam*: “Many such women are already gone after Satan.” But if St. Paul spake this of the breach of vows, with what eyes then, M. Harding, do you read his words? or what advantage can you hope to find in such authorities, as do so expressly cry against yourself? St. Paul saith even there in the same place: *Vidua eligatur non minor annis sexaginta.... Juniores viduas rejice.... Volo juniores viduas nubere: liberos gignere: domum administrare: nullam occasionem dare adversario, ut habeat maledicendi causam*: “Let no widow be chosen under *threescore years of age*. *Refuse young widows. I will that young widows be married*: bring up their children: oversee their house: and give no occasion to the adversary to speak ill.”

If these words of St. Paul must needs be taken of vows, and none otherwise, why do you so violently, contrary to St. Paul's commandment, either force or suffer young maids and girls to receive these vows? why do ye not stay them until they be stricken in age, as St. Paul willeth you, that they may be threescore years old before they vow? It is no reason ye should in one place claim by one word, and break so many.

You say: “The vow of chastity is annexed unto holy orders by the ancient constitution of the church, and by

Hieronym. in
Proem. in
Epist. ad
Titum. [iv.
407.]

1 Tim. v. 9.

Fol. 79 b.

the apostles of Christ." For trial of your truth herein, I beseech you to consider these few instead of many.

Your own allowed and principal doctor Gratian saith thus : *Copula sacerdotalis, vel consanguineorum, nec legali, nec evangelica, nec apostolica autoritate prohibetur* : "Priests' marriage is not forbidden by any authority, either of the law of Moses, or of the gospel, or of the apostles."

Clemens
Stromat. lib.
3. [i. 550.]

Clemens Alexandrinus saith : *Omnes apostoli epistolæ, quæ moderationem docent, et continentiam, cum et de matrimonio, et de liberorum procreatione, et de domus administratione innumerabilia præcepta contineant, nunquam tamen honestum, moderatumque matrimonium prohibuerunt* : "All the epistles of the apostle, which teach sobriety and continent life, whereas they contain innumerable precepts touching matrimony, bringing up children, and government of house, yet they never forbade honest and sober marriage."

Card. Cajetan.
in Quodlibetis, contra
Lutherum. [fol. 61.
col. 2.]

Cardinal Cajetan saith : *Nec ratione, nec autoritate probari potest, quod, absolute loquendo, sacerdos peccet contrahendo matrimonium.....Nam nec ordo, in quantum ordo, nec ordo, in quantum sacer, est impeditivus matrimonii.....Siquidem sacerdotium non dirimit matrimonium contractum, sive ante, sive post : seclusis omnibus legibus ecclesiasticis : stando tantum iis, quæ habemus a Christo, et apostolis* : "It cannot be proved, neither by reason nor by authority, speaking absolutely, that a priest sinneth in marrying a wife. For neither the order of priesthood, in that it is order, nor the same order, in that it is holy, is any hinderance to matrimony. For priesthood breaketh not marriage, whether it be contracted before priesthood or afterward : setting all ecclesiastical laws apart, and standing only unto those things that we have of Christ and his apostles."

Panormitan.
de Cleric.
Conjuga.
Cum olim.
[Decretal.
lib. 3. tom.
iii. fol. 16.
col. 1 a.]

Abbot Panormitane saith : *Continentia non est de substantia ordinis, nec de jure Divino* : "Single life is not of the substance of the order of priesthood, nor of the law of God."

Antonin. in
Summa, pt.
3. tit. i. cap.
21. [§. 3.]

Likewise Antoninus saith : *Episcopatus ex natura sua non habet opponi ad matrimonium* : "The office or degree

of a bishop, of the *substance or nature of itself*, is not contrary to matrimony." Hereby ye may easily see, M. Harding, how true it is that you say: "The vow of chastity is annexed to holy orders, and that by the apostles' ancient constitution."

"But this order," you say, "was taken, for that, having the use of wedlock, we cannot pray." And to that end ye allege the authority of St. Paul: where also ye might have alleged the names and sayings of sundry fathers. Origen saith: "The Holy Ghost in time of copulation forsaketh a man, yea although he were a prophet of God." Another saith: *Virginitas sola potest animas hominum præsentare Deo*: "Only virginity is able to present the soul of a man unto God." St. Hierom saith: *Quotiescunque uxori debitum reddo, orare non possum*: "As often as I do my duty to my wife, I cannot pray." And to this purpose pope Siricius undiscreeily and fondly abuseth the holy word of God. Thus he saith: *Qui in carne sunt, Deo placere non possunt*: "They that be in the flesh cannot please God."

Origen. in
Num. hom.
6. [il. 288.]

Extra de
Probationib.
in Giossa.

Hieron. ad-
vers. Jovin.
lib. 1. [iv. pt.
2. p. 150.]

Inter Decret.
Siricii, cap. 7.
Rom. viii.

These words seem very hard, and sound much to the derogation of God's ordinance. And therefore Ignatius, St. John's scholar, saith: *Si quis legitimam commixtionem, et filiorum procreationem, corruptionem, et coinquinationem vocat,.....ille habet cohabitatores dæmones apostatam*: "If any man call lawful copulation and begetting of children, corruption and filthiness: *he hath the devil that fell from God dwelling within him*"⁶⁶.

Ignatius ad
Philadelph.
[Russel, ii.
137.]

In like manner say the learned godly bishops in the council of Gangra: *Si quis discernit presbyterum conjugatum, tanquam occasione nuptiarum, quod offerre non debeat, et ab ejus oblatione abstinet, anathema sit*: "If any man make *difference of a married priest*, as if he may not minister the oblation (or holy communion) because of his marriage, and abstaineth from his oblation, accursed be he."

Concil. Gan-
gren. cap. 4.
[il. 1101.]

Likewise it is written in the council of Constantinople: *Si quis præsumperit, contra apostolicos canones, aliquos*

Dist. 31.
Quoniam.

⁶⁶ [This quotation is from the larger or interpolated edition of St. Ignatius' Epistles.]

presbyterorum et diaconorum privare a contractu, et communione legalis uxoris suæ, deponatur. Similiter et presbyter, aut diaconus, qui religionis causa uxorem suam expellit, excommunicetur: “If any man, contrary to the apostles’ canon, presume to remove either priest or deacon from the use and company of his lawful wife, let him be deprived. And in like manner let the priest or deacon be excommunicate, that putteth away his wife under the colour of religion⁶⁷.”

1 Cor. vii. 5.

As touching the place of St. Paul: “Defraud not yourselves one another, unless it be of consent for a season, that ye may attend unto fasting and prayer.” He speaketh not this of that kind of prayer, that is commonly and daily used of all the faithful, as well married as unmarried, but only of the general and solemn prayer of the whole congregation, which then, as in time of persecution and fear of enemies, was kept only in the night, and all the whole multitude of the faithful was charged to be present at the same. At which times it was necessary, that both the man and the wife should leave the one the other’s company, and resort to prayer.

Joel ii. 15.

So it is written in the prophet Joel: “Blow up the trump in Sion: proclaim a solemn fast: call together a congregation of the people. Let the bridegroom leave his bed: let the spouse come from her chamber. Let the priests, the ministers of God, weep between the entry and the altar: and let them say, O Lord spare thy people, and give not over thine inheritance unto confusion.” Of the like kind of general and solemn prayer, Tertullian saith thus: *Quis solemnibus paschæ abnoctantem uxorem securus sustinebit?* “What man” (being an heathen) “can without mistrust suffer his wife” (being a Christian woman) “to be away from him at the solemnity of the Easter prayer?”

Tertull. ad
Uxorem, lib.
2. [cap. 4. p.
168.]

Of such solemn and seldom meetings St. Paul speaketh: and not of the daily, usual, and common prayers of all Christians.

Otherwise, touching the purity and holiness of married

⁶⁷ [This passage is from the Sextum. The original will be 13th canon of the Concil. Quini- found in Bruns, vol. i. pp. 41, 42.]

people, St. Augustine saith : *Quod Paulus ait, Quæ innupta est, cogitat ea, quæ sunt Domini, ut sit sancta et corpore et spiritu, non sic accipiendum est, ut putemus, non esse sanctam corpore Christianam conjugem castam.* *Omnibus quippe fidelibus dictum est, Nescitis, quoniam corpora vestra templum sunt Spiritus Sancti ? Sancta sunt etiam corpora conjugatorum, fidem sibi, et Domino servantium :* “Whereas St. Paul saith, She that is unmarried thinketh of the things that pertain unto the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit : it may not so be taken, as though we should think a Christian wife living chastely with her husband is not holy in body. For it is *generally said unto all faithful* : Know ye not that your bodies be the temple of the Holy Ghost ? Therefore, if the *man and wife* keep their faith both between themselves and to the Lord, *their bodies are holy.*”

But “these evangelical vowbreakers,” saith M. Harding, “pretend Paphnutius to be their proctor.” Whether he be our proctor or no, it forceth not greatly. Notwithstanding it is plain, he was then the only proctor for the truth, and that against the general consent of all the whole council besides. And although he were but one man alone, yet the whole council gave place unto him. Sozomenus saith : *Synodus laudavit sententiam Paphnutii, et nihil ex hac parte sancivit : sed hoc in uniuscujusque voluntate, sine ulla necessitate reliquit :* “The council commended Paphnutius’ judgment, and touching this matter of marriage made no decree at all, but left it to each man’s own will, without any force of necessity.”

Of our side thus much Paphnutius saith : “*Marriage is honourable :* and the company of man and wife is” (not filthiness, as these men seem to say, but) “*cleanness and chastity.*”

But, M. Harding, if the same holy father Paphnutius weigh so much of your side as you pretend, wherefore then doth one of your companions of Louvain so lightly and so disdainfully control that whole story, with the utter discredit and condemnation of the writers ? For thus hath he not doubted to publish his judgment therein to all the

Copus Dia-
logo 1. p.
154.

world: *Mihi, nescio quomodo, in dubium venit fides hujus historiæ de Paphnutio. Sunt enim, quæ suspicionem important, eam esse Arianorum, aut impudicorum hominum commentum.....Tota enim hæc res a Socrate pendet et Sozomeno: quorum alter Novatianus fuit: alter Theodorum Mopsuestensem a quinta synodo damnatum magnis laudibus extulit: "I know not how, this story of Paphnutius seemeth to me to be of doubtful credit. For there be matters that make me to suspect that it is but a vain forged tale, either of the Arian heretics, or of some other filthy persons. The whole matter hangeth of Socrates and Sozomenus: of which two, the one was a Novatian heretic⁶⁷, the other highly commendeth Theodorus of Mopsuesta, being condemned by the fifth council."*

Thus your fellows make this whole story to be but a vain fable: and the authors and writers hereof, Socrates and Sozomenus, to be heretics, Novatians, Arians, dishonest and shameless persons. And therefore, I trow, ye will not say, they are your proctors.

Chrysost. in
Epist. ad Tit.
hom. 2. [xi.
738.]

Whereas St. Chrysostom saith, Marriage is so reverend a thing, that a man may therewith ascend into the holy throne, and be made a bishop, notwithstanding he have a wife: and that St. Paul suffereth not them that have twice married to attain such a room: "By these words," saith M. Harding, "Chrysostom condemneth the impure bigamy of our holy gospellers." Again he saith: "If this defender press us with Chrysostom, we answer, that although Chrysostom grant that a married man may ascend to the holy seat, yet he saith not, that a man may descend from that holy seat to the bride-bed. For we deny utterly, that any man, after that he hath received holy orders, may marry. Neither can it be shewed, that the marriage of such was ever accounted lawful in the catholic church."

I doubt not, good reader, but it shall easily appear, that M. Harding in either of these two parts was foully deceived. For first Chrysostom, as it is plain by his words, which M. Harding in his translation hath purposely falsi-

⁶⁷ [Cave, after Valesius, has favourer of the Novatians, than a shewn, that Socrates was rather a Novatian himself.]

fied, expoundeth these words of St. Paul, “the husband of one wife,” not of a man, that never had but one wife in all his time, but of a man that hath but one wife at one time. If M. Harding shall think this exposition to be strange and unlikely, let him remember that Chrysostom himself thereof writeth thus : *Unius uxoris virum. Non hoc, veluti sanciens, dicit, quasi non liceat absque uxore episcopum fieri, sed ejus rei modum constituens. Judæis quippe licitum erat, etiam secundo matrimonio jungi, et duas itidem simul habere uxores* : “The husband of one wife : St. Paul writeth not this as making a law, as if it were not lawful for a man to be made a bishop without a wife : but he appointeth an order in that behalf. For it was lawful for the Jews to be coupled in the second matrimony, and to have two wives at one time⁶⁸.”

Chrysost. in Epist. 1. ad Tim. hom. 10. [xl. 598.]

In like sort saith St. Hieron : *Quidam de hoc loco ita sentiunt : Judaicæ, inquit, consuetudinis fuit, vel binas uxores habere, vel plures.....Et hoc nunc volunt esse præceptum, ne is, qui episcopus eligendus est, uno tempore duas pariter uxores habeat* : “Touching this place, some men think thus : By the custom of the Jews it was lawful for a man to have *two wives or mo at once*. And this they take to be the apostle’s commandment, that he that is to be chosen a bishop have not *two wives or mo together at one time*.” Again he saith : *Diaconi sint unius uxoris viri : non, ut si non habuerint, ducant : sed ne duas habeant* : “Let the deacons be the husbands of *one wife* : not that they should needs marry a wife, if they have none : but that they should not have *two wives together*⁶⁹.” Likewise saith cardinal Cajetan : *Apostolus episcopis permittit unam uxorem, cæteris plures* : “The apostle suffereth a bishop to have *one wife* : others he suffereth to have *mo*.”

Hieron. in Epist. ad Titum, cap. c. [iv. 414.]

Hieron. in Epist. 1. ad Tim. cap. 3. [v. 1089.]

Catharinus contra errores Cajetan. error. 99. [p. 196.]

And to this purpose Isidorus seemeth to say : *Casti-* Dist. 23. His igitur.

⁶⁸ [Chrysost. in Epist. 1. ad Tim. μίας γυναῖκος ἄνδρα οὐ νομοθετῶν τοῦτό φησιν, ὥς μὴ εἶναι ἐξόν ἀνευ τούτου γίνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀμετρίαν κωλύων. ἐπειδὴ ἐπὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐξῆν καὶ δευτέροις ὀμιλεῖν γάμοις, καὶ δύο ἔχειν κατὰ ταυτὸν γυναῖκας.]

⁶⁹ [Hieron. in Epist. ad Timoth. This commentary, falsely attributed to St. Jerome, is now generally ascribed to some Pelagian heretic, by some to Pelagius himself. See the Bened. ed., Cave, &c.]

moniam non violati corporis perpetuo observare studeant : aut certe unius matrimonii vinculo fœderentur : “ Let them study to keep and continue the chastity of their body undefiled : or else, let them be coupled with the *band of one marriage.*”

Leo, ad Episcopos Mauritan. [ed. Lugd. 1700, tom. i. 205. col. 1.]

Of such a one pope Leo wrote sometime unto the bishop of Mauritania : *Sicut ad nos relatum est, duarum simul est maritus uxorum :* “ As we are informed, he is *at one time the husband of two wives.*” And therefore he addeth his judgment of him : *Privandum honore decernimus :* “ We think him meet to be deprived of his promotion.”

31. quæst. 1. Hac ratione.

Of this kind of second marriage Chrysostom speaketh, I mean of having two wives alive together : and not of marrying the second wife after the death of the former. And therefore he saith : *Secundum quidem accipere secundum præceptum apostoli licitum est : secundum autem veritatis rationem vere fornicatio est. Sed cum permittente Deo, publice, et licenter permittitur, fit honesta fornicatio :* “ To take the *second wife*” (while the first is alive) “ according to the apostle’s commandment, it is lawful : but by the judgment of the truth, *indeed it is fornication.* But while as by God’s permission it is openly and lawfully suffered, *the fornication is made honest.*” The last clause the Gloss there expoundeth thus : *Fornicatio cum ea, quam permisit Moses post repudiatam assumi :* “ Fornication, I mean, with her whom Moses suffered to be taken to wife, *after the divorce of the first.*”

[Ibid. in Glossa.]

Tertullian. de Monogamia. [cap. 12. p. 533.]

Thus therefore St. Chrysostom saith, that such a man as had “ two wives together at one time,” or was “ divorced from one wife and had married another,” might not be chosen to be a bishop. For otherwise Tertullian saith unto the bishops of the catholic church : *Apud vos episcopi sunt digami :* “ There be bishops among you” (he meaneth among the catholics) “ that have married *two wives,*” the one after the death of the other⁷⁰.

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Tit. hom. ii. [xi. 738.]

If all this will not suffice, I refer myself to Chrysostom’s own words : thus he writeth : “ St. Paul restraineth unchaste persons, not permitting them *that have married two*

⁷⁰ [Tertull. “ Quod enim et digami præsent apud vos.” He is speaking of bishops.]

wives⁷¹ to be chosen to the government of the church."

His reasons be these: *Nam qui uxori quæ decessit (a se) benevolentiam nullam servasse deprehenditur, quo pacto potest ille esse bonus præceptor ecclesiæ? Ino quibus criminibus non subjicitur indies? Nostis enim, quod etsi per leges secundæ nuptiæ permittuntur, tamen ea res accusationibus multis patet:* "For he that is found to have borne no good will unto his wife" (not that is dead, but) "*that is gone from him*"⁷², how can he be a meet master for the church of God? Nay rather, to what quarrels and accusations" (by mean of these two wives) "shall he not be subject every day? For you know, although by the law the marriage of the second wife" (after the divorce of the first) "*be suffered, yet the matter lieth open to many offences.*"

"It appeareth," saith Chrysostom, "that he bare no good will towards his former wife," not that now is dead, but "that is divorced," and so departed from him. And therefore oftentimes grow many accusations and griefs between the wives, the children, the friends and others, for parting of goods, for restoring of dowries, and other like quarrels. For to have spoken of "good will or affection" towards the former wife, being dead, it had been impertinent, and to no purpose.

Thus much touching Chrysostom's judgment upon these words of St. Paul, "the husband of one wife." Notwithstanding, I deny not but certain other ancient and learned fathers have taken it otherwise.

Last of all, M. Harding unawares falleth into the same negative divinity that he so often and so much abhorreth. For thus he saith: "We deny utterly, that any man, after that he hath received holy orders, may marry. Neither can it be shewed that the marriage of such was ever accounted lawful in the catholic church." If this tale be true, then be all the Greek priests votaries, as well as the Latins. But it is noted upon the Decrees: *Græci* [leg. ^{Dist. 31.} Quoniam. In margine.] *continentiam non promittunt, vel tacite, vel ex-*

⁷¹ [... οὐκ ἀφίεις μετὰ δευτέρου γάμου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκχειρίζεσθαι ταύτην.]
⁷² [Harding in his Detection,

fol. 306 a, disputes the correctness of bishop Jewel's translation, which appears, to say the least, doubtful.]

Concil. An-
cyran, can. 9.
[al. can. 10.
Mansi ii.
517.]

presse : “The Greeks make no promise of continent or single life, neither secretly, nor expressly.” And in the council holden at Ancyra it is concluded thus : *Diaconi quicunque ordinantur, si in ipsa ordinatione protestati sunt, et dixerunt velle se conjugio copulari, quia sic manere non possunt, hi, si postmodum uxores duxerint, in ministerio maneat : propterea quod episcopus illis licentiam dederit* : “Deacons, as many as be ordered, if at the time of receiving orders they made protestation, and said that *they would marry*, for that they find not themselves able so to continue without marriage, *if they afterward marry*, let them continue in the ministry : forasmuch as the bishop hath given them license.” M. Harding, I trow, will not deny but deaconship is one of the holy orders. Yet deacons at the time of their consecration, making protestation solemnly before the bishop, were licensed by this council to marry at any time afterward : and the same marriage, contrary to M. Harding’s position, was evermore in the catholic church accounted lawful.

M. Harding,
fol. 298 b.

Addition. ¶ M. Harding. “This proveth not that deacons did marry, nor that any bishop ever gave them leave to marry.” *The answer.* What then doth it prove, M. Harding? or to what purpose was it thus decreed by the council? Whether deacons married or no, I will not strive. Certainly it appeareth hereby, it was lawful for them to marry. Yea, although they were within holy orders, and that by the authority and warrant of this council. ¶

Dist. 31.
Aliter.

So saith pope Stephen : *Græcorum sacerdotes, diaconi, aut subdiaconi matrimonio copulantur* : “The Greek priests, deacons, or subdeacons, are coupled in matrimony.” Upon which words the Gloss noteth thus : *Multi ex hac litera dixerunt, quod orientales possunt contrahere in sacris ordinibus* : “Many have said, upon occasion of this text, that the *priests of the east church*” (contrary to that M. Harding so certainly here assureth us) “*may marry, being within holy orders.*”

Gloss, Dist.
31. Aliter.

M. Harding,
299 b.

Addition. ¶ M. Harding. “If you had rehearsed the whole decree as you found it, you had marred your cause, and played the simple proctor, &c. And whereas you allege the Gloss for you, you make all that be able to read the

Addition.

Addition.

place, witnesses of your impudency. Whereas the decree hath *matrimonio copulantur*, the Gloss expoundeth it thus, *id est, copulato utuntur*. As for the other words of the Gloss, "many, upon occasion of this text, have said, that they of the east church may marry within holy orders," it is not the mind of the Gloss, but as some say," &c. *The answer.* You say: "If I had rehearsed the whole decree, I had marred my cause." Never a whit, M. Harding. A little before I rehearsed it whole: and yet is the cause nothing impaired. "The Gloss," you say, "is against me." I grant you: weigh better my words. I deny it not. What moveth you thus to cry out: "Impudency and corruption of Glosses?" Lay our words together, M. Harding. I say none otherwise but as the Gloss hath said. I have neither added, nor diminished, nor altered or changed one syllable. I beseech you, doth not the Gloss say thus: *Multi ex hac litera dixerunt, quod orientales possunt contrahere in sacris ordinibus?* "Upon occasion of this text, many men have said, that the priests of the east church may marry, notwithstanding they be within holy orders." And do not I from syllable to syllable say the same? Ye deal uncourteously, M. Harding. Ye are to blame, with such upbraidings and outcries so much to abuse your simple reader. But you say: "The Gloss is directly against me." So is the same Gloss directly against the ancient council of Ancyra before alleged. Will you therefore say: "The council was impudent?" Compare them well together. You shall find them plain contrary: the Gloss directly against the council. Now judge you, M. Harding, whether of these ye will believe, either the council, or your Gloss. Howbeit, let the council give place: and let Glosses prevail. Yet, not long after, the same Gloss saith thus: *Dicunt, quod olim sacerdotes poterant contrahere, ante Siricium*: "They say, that in old times, before the time of pope Siricius, it was lawful for priests to marry." And pope Siricius was well near four hundred years after Christ. To conclude, I have not any way corrupted one syllable of your Gloss. The words thereof be clear: "Upon occasion of this text, many men

Concil. Ancyra. cap. 10.
[il. 517.]

Dist. 84.
Cum in Preterito, in Glossa.

have said, that the priests of the east church may marry, notwithstanding they be in holy orders." ➡

And of the priests of the west church cardinal Cajetan saith: *Papa potest dispensare cum sacerdote occidentalis ecclesiæ, ut uxorem ducat, nulla existente causa publicæ utilitatis*: "The pope may dispense with a priest of the west church to marry a wife, although there be no manner cause of profit growing thereby to the commonweal."

Catharinus
contra Error.
Cajetan.
error. 103.
[p. 196.]

Athanasius saith: *Multi quoque ex episcopis matrimonia non inierunt: monachi contra parentes liberorum facti sunt*: "Many of the bishops" (he saith not all, but many) "have not married." (By which words he giveth us to understand that some have married.) "Contrariwise monks have become fathers of children"⁷².

Athanasius
ad Dracontium,
p. 518.
[Ben. ed. i.
268.]

Cassiodorus writeth thus: *In illo tempore ferunt martyrio vitam finisse..... Eupsychium Cæsariensem (episcopum) ducta nuper uxore, dum adhuc quasi sponsus esse videretur*: "At that time they say Eupsychius (the bishop) of Cæsarea died in martyrdom, having married a wife a little before, being as yet in manner a new-married man."

Cassiodor.
lib. 6. cap. 14.

Addition. ➡ M. Harding. "Fie upon such shameless falsifiers. O lamentable state: such false prophets: this shameless lie, &c. The truth is, good reader, neither Cassiodorus wrote thus, nor Eupsychius was ever bishop of Cæsarea, nor of any other place, nor so much as a priest, deacon, or subdeacon. The writer of the said story, which we have of this blessed martyr Eupsychius, is Sozomenus the Greek: who, with the ecclesiastical story of Socrates and Theodoretus, was translated into Latin by one Epiphanius Scholasticus, out of which three Cassiodorus gathered the abridgment that we have under the name of the Tripartite History. The place truly repeated hath these words: *In illo tempore ferunt vitam finisse matrimonio Basilium ecclesiæ Ancyranæ presbyterum, et Eupsychium*

M. Harding,
fol. 302 a.

Hist. Tripart.
lib. 6. cap. 1.

⁷² [Harding in his Detection expresses a wish, that "they of Basil" would set forth Athanasius' works in Greek. But the Greek more than bears out Jewel: πολλοί δὲ τῶν ἐπισκόπων οὐδὲ γεγάμηκασιν,

μοναχοὶ δὲ πατέρες τέκνων γεγόνασι. St. Athanasius adds: ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπισκόπους (sc. οἶδαμεν) πατέρας τέκνων, καὶ μοναχοὺς ἐξ ὁλοκλήρου γένους τυγχάνοντας.]

Cæsariensem Cappadociæ, ducta nuper uxore, cum adhuc quasi sponsus videretur. Here is no mention made that Euppsychius was the bishop of Cæsarea. The story, as we have it in Latin of Epiphanius' turning, called him only *Euppsychium Cæsariensem Cappadociæ*: that is to say, Euppsychius, a man of Cæsarea, that is in Cappadocia. For thus he reporteth of him in the Greek: *Εὐψύχιον Καισαρέα Καππαδοκῶν τῶν ἐνπατριδῶν: Euppsychium Cæsariensem Cappadociæ patricium*: as much to say, Euppsychius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, a nobleman, or one of the lords of the city. Thus is Euppsychius, whom M. Jewel hath made a bishop, (as much as he is himself,) found to be a lay gentleman, or nobleman of the city of Cæsarea. Because M. Jewel knew this much right well, contrary to the custom he useth at other times, he dissembled the Greek original, and thought he might better father this shameful lie upon Cassiodorus, meaning the Latin translation of Epiphanius. And to help the matter, he stuck not to put in this word (*episcopum*, bishop) of his own, and so calleth him boldly, Euppsychius the bishop of Cæsarea. Let these men have leave thus to corrupt and falsify the fathers, and by them they shall be able to prove what they list." *The answer.* Fie, M. Harding: why should you thus fare and torment yourself without greater cause? Take your own demand: let it be that Euppsychius was no bishop: yet is it such "impudency," or "false prophecy," to think that he was a bishop? Why, more than that, one of your fellows of Louvain saith: "That Oza the poor Levite was a king." An error ye may say it was, but "false prophecy" ye cannot call it. Albeit, whether Euppsychius were a bishop or no, I will not strive. They were both wise and learned, that so have thought: and if I may be so bold, M. Harding, to tell you the truth, he hath neither wit nor learning that maintaineth the contrary. The words of Cassiodorus, or Epiphanius Scholasticus, seem very plain: *Ferunt vitam finisse martyrio Basilium ecclesiæ Ancyranæ presbyterum, et Euppsychium Cæsariensem Cappadociæ, &c.* Howsoever it were, Euppsychius,

Sozomen.
lib. 5. cap. 11.

Dorman,
[fol. 24.]

for ought that you know, M. Harding, might well have been a bishop : but Oza could in no wise be a king.

As for the reasons ye bring to the contrary, to prove that Euppsychius was no bishop, they weigh but little.

Cæsariensis.

Thus you say : " He is called Euppsychius Cæsariensis, Euppsychius one of Cæsarea : " you say : " He is called a nobleman, born of an ancient house, and of noble parentage."

What then, M. Harding ? will you therefore conclude, he was no bishop ? what logic may this be ? We say commonly : Augustinus Hipponensis : Eusebius Cæsariensis : Hosius Cordubensis : Ambrosius Mediolanensis. As for Nicephorus, whom you so unadvisedly say " I have foully belied," as he in this place saith Euppsychius Cæsariensis, not naming him *bishop*, so in another place he saith, Protogenes Sardicensis, Marcellus Ancyranus, Gregorius Perinthius, Narcissus Irenopolitanus, Acacius Cæsariensis, Gregorius Laodicensis, &c. never calling any of them by the name of *bishop* : and yet, I trow, ye will not deny but they were bishops, this manner of writing notwithstanding.

Nicephor.
lib. 9. cap. 12.
[i. 696.]

Patritius.

Again : St. Ambrose was a nobleman, of consular dignity : yet was he the *bishop* of Milan. St. Gregory was *senatorius*, a nobleman of the dignity or degree of a counsellor : yet was he the *bishop* of Rome. And not to seek far abroad for examples, Osmond was the earl of Dorset : Robert Nevill, Richard Beauchamp, and Edmund Audley were noblemen, of noble parentage, and lords' brethren : yet were they all *bishops* of Salisbury. The pope himself of late years hath been called *lord of lords*, and *king of kings* : shall we therefore think he was no *bishop* ? I weigh not the matter, M. Harding : I weigh only your reasons⁷³. If this example of Euppsychius like you not, we have others sufficient to prove that good men have married within holy orders. St. Hierom saith : *Hodie quoque multi* [leg. *plurimi*] *sacerdotes habent matrimonia* : " Even nowadays many priests live in wedlock." And to answer you with like order and form of words, as Epiphanius saith :

Hieron. ad-
versus Jovin.
lib. 1. [iv. pt.
2. p. 165.]

⁷³ [See the Preface to the ed. of the Defence published in 1570 (supra vol. iv. 108, 109).]

Eupsychius Cæsariensis Cappadociæ, ducta nuper uxore, dum adhuc quasi sponsus videretur, &c. Even so saith Vincentius, of Phileas, a bishop in Egypt: *Phileas de civitate Thmui, nobili genere, et non parvis opibus, suscepto episcopatu, uxorem habuit et liberos* [leg. *librum de laude martyrum composuit*]: “Phileas of the city of Thmuis, a nobleman and of great riches, being consecrate bishop, had wife and children⁷⁴.” He was a nobleman, and had wife and children, and yet, that notwithstanding, was a bishop.

Vincent. lib. 13. cap. 25.

But you will say: “It appeareth not hitherto by any thing that is yet alleged, that Eupsychius was a bishop.” What of that, M. Harding? You know there have been many bishops in the world, of whom it would be hard for you to make certain proof that they were no bishops. Yet notwithstanding, for your pleasure, and for some satisfaction of your friends, that you may the better understand your error, and know that this Eupsychius was a bishop indeed, I pray you read the first Oration of Athanasius against the Arians⁷⁵. There shall you find these words among others: *Scripta Sylvestri, et Protogenis episcoporum Daciæ: et Leontii et Eupsychii episcoporum Cappadociæ*: “The writings of Leontius and Eupsychius, bishops of Cappadocia.” Mark well these words, M. Harding: “Eupsychius a bishop of Cappadocia.” Athanasius saith: “Eupsychius was a bishop,” and sheweth the country of his *see*. You say: “Eupsychius was a nobleman of ancient parentage.” And therefore you tell us, “he was no bishop.” Athanasius knew Eupsychius, or might have known him: for they lived both in one age. And Athanasius wrote an epistle specially unto him, as it may appear in the second council of Nice: in which council he is

Athanasius contra Arianos, Orat. [1. 278.]

Eupsychius was a bishop.

⁷⁴ [The reference to Vincentii Speculum should be lib. 12. cap. 25 (the *martyrdom* of Phileas is however repeated in lib. 13). Bp. Jewel is right in saying that Phileas is represented as a married man, inasmuch as in cap. 24, he is described as refusing to be deterred from undergoing martyrdom by the cries of his wife and

children; but the words “uxorem habuit et liberos” do not stand in the sentence quoted, which is completed by the words introduced between brackets.]

⁷⁵ [This is not one of the four Orations contra Arianos; but is a distinct work, entitled in the Ben. ed. Epist. ad Episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ.]

Eupsychius
a priest.
Concil. Nl-
cen. 2. act. 6.
p. 82. Colo-
niæ. [Mansi
xiii. 317.]

called : *Eupsychius presbyter Cæsariæ* : “ Eupsychius a priest of Cæsarea,” as at that time as yet being no *bishop*, but only a *priest*. But you, M. Harding, neither knew him ever, nor could ever have known him. And yet will you look to have more credit herein than that godly and learned father Athanasius, that wrote unto him, and either knew him familiarly, or might have known him ? Athanasius spake the truth : you go only by guess. Athanasius spake in simplicity : you speak of affection as a party. Now may your indifferent reader judge, whether of both he may better believe, either you, or the ancient father Athanasius. You say : “ Eupsychius was no bishop :” Athanasius saith : “ Eupsychius was a priest.” Again he saith : “ Eupsychius was a bishop.” And lest your reader should think there lieth some error in the name, and that Athanasius meant one Eupsychius and you another, he sheweth you also of the place of his bishopric, and saith he was bishop of Cappadocia. Now the same Eupsychius, of whom we speak, was the bishop of Cæsarea : and Cæsarea was the chief city of Cappadocia. “ Thus have we found,” say you, “ that Eupsychius was a lay gentleman, or a nobleman of Cæsarea : but neither priest, nor bishop.”

But indeed we have found that Eupsychius was both a *nobleman*, and a *martyr*, and a *priest*, and a *bishop* too. The *name*, the *time*, the *country*, the *see*, and the *city* do all agree. And this same Eupsychius, being a *bishop*, *married a wife*, and at the time of his martyrdom *was a new-married man*. “ As good a bishop,” you say, “ as M. Jewel.” This is your pleasure, M. Harding. Would God M. Jewel were as good as he. Take heed for your credit’s sake : your friends will espy you. There wanteth consideration and sobriety in your doings. Ye avouch over boldly before you know. You say : “ Fic upon such shameless falsifiers :” “ O lamentable state :” “ such false prophets :” “ such shameless lies.” These be your own words : ye have pleasure in them. Beware lest your friends turn them over upon yourself. ☞

Dist. 84.
Cum in Præ-
terito, in
Gloss.

Likewise M. Harding might have found it noted in his own Gloss : *Dicunt quod olim sacerdotes poterant contra-*

here, *ante Siricium* : “ They say that in old times, before pope Siricius,” (which was about four hundred years after Christ,) “ *it was lawful for priests to marry.*”

But we shall have occasion to speak hereof more hereafter. In the mean season, good Christian reader, by these few, as by a taste, thou mayest easily judge how true it is that M. Harding telleth thee, that marriage in them that had received holy orders was never thought lawful in the catholic church.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. Divis. 2.

And, as Sozomenus saith of Spiridion : and, as [Nazianz. Orat. funebr. in patrem. l. 335.] Nazianzen saith of his own father, we say : that a good and diligent bishop doth serve in the ministry never the worse for that he is married, but rather the better, and with more ableness to do good.

M. HARDING.

Were it not that the weight of these matters required an upright and plain dealing, for civility's sake, I could be content sometimes to spare you, and where ye make manifest lies, to use a softer word, and term them fittens. But now, if I tell you that you use your accustomed figure *pseudologia*, which is lying in plain English, I trust you will bear with my plainness : amend your own fault, and consider the power of truth, that causeth me to be so bold with you. This I ^a am sure of, that neither Sozomenus, nor Gregory Nazianzen, nor Eusebius, lib. 10, cap. 5, as you have caused your books, both Latin and English, to be noted in the margin, where ye mistake Eusebius for Ruffinus : ^b nor Nazianzen either in Monodia, as you note also in the margin, nor in the funeral Oration that he made of his father, hath any such saying as ye report of them. For how could they say, “ that a bishop serveth in his ministry never the worse, but rather the better, and with more ableness to do good, for that he is married,” the scripture being so plain to the contrary ? What, ween ye they were either so ignorant, or so forgetful, or so much inclined to promote your carnal doctrine of priests' marriages, as to say so, notwithstanding that St. Paul writeth to the Corinthians ? Saith he not of them that be married, “ that such shall have tribulation of the flesh ?” Saith he not, “ He that is without a wife careth for the things of our Lord, how he may please God ?” Of him that hath a wife, saith he not, “ that he careth

Sozomenus, Gregory Nazianzen, Eusebius belied by the author of the Apology.

a M. Harding is assured before he know.

b An unadvised untruth : read the answer.

St. Paul writeth thus, not of priests and bishops, but of all other Christian men.

for the things that be the world's, how he may please his wife, and is divided?" Finally, saith he not, "I tell you this thing for your profit, not to tangle you in a snare, but for that which is honest and comely unto you, and that which may give you readiness to pray to God without let?" Wherefore recant for shame that foul error, "that a bishop serveth the better in his ministry, and is the more able to do good, for that he is married.".....

M. Harding's
modesty.

Such men, such doctrine: fleshly men, fleshly doctrine.....

Now therefore see you not, how great is your impudency, in that you lie yourself, and father such a foul lie upon Sozomenus, and that light of the world, in his time, Gregory Nazianzen?

.....The words of Sozomenus be these: ἐγένετο γὰρ οὗτος ἀγροίκος, γαμετὴν καὶ παῖδας ἔχων: ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο τὰ θεῖα χείρων: that is to say, "Spiridion was a husbandman, having wife and children, and yet for all that, he was never the worse about God's service."

Llb. i. cap.
11. [ii. p. 22.]

Never the
worse.

Of this place, we grant, ye may say with Sozomenus, that Spiridion "served God never the worse" for that he was married. But how and whereof gather ye that he served God the better, and was more able to do good because of his marriage?.....

c Untruth.
For Chrysostom maketh the case general.

Spiridion obtained that privilege through c especial grace, by his exceeding virtue, which is granted to few. And the privileges of a few make not a law for all in general, ye know, as Nazianzen saith.

Furthermore, if the words of Sozomenus that ye build your carnal doctrine upon be well examined, ye shall find, that he maketh more against you than with you. For signifying that he had wife and children, he addeth: ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο τὰ θεῖα χείρων: "Yet for all that he was never the worse about God's service." This revocation or exception negative ("yet for all that," &c.) implieth a confession affirmative to the contrary.....

Neither maketh the place of Gregory Nazianzen any whit for you more than this of Sozomenus doth, whose words be these after the translation of Raphael Volateranus, varying much from the Greek: d *Hic Basilii pater, Basilii item appellatus, etsi matrimonio se vinxit, ita tamen in eo vixit, ut nihil propterea ad perfectam virtutem, ac philosophiam consequendam impediretur*: "Basil's father, who was named also Basil, although he put himself in bonds of matrimony, yet he lived so herein, as he was letted no whit from the attaining of perfect virtue and holy knowledge." Were not marriage a let and hinderance to perfection requisite in a bishop, this learned man could not rightly have said: *Ita tamen in eo vixit*, &c.: "Yet for all that he lived so," &c.

The place of
Sozomenus
alleged by
the defenders
makes utterly
against them.
Nazianzen's
words re-
turned upon
the defender.

d An error.
M. Harding
taketh one
place for
another.

Nothing
hindered.

Right so it is easy to put him from the hold he taketh of Chrysostom, by Chrysostom himself. For lest any man should think, whereas St. Paul saith, a bishop ought to be the husband of one wife, that the same order continueth still in the church, thereto he saith in his second homily, *De Pœnitentia Job*: Non

Tim. i.

Read the
answer.

ea ratione, quod id nunc in ecclesia observetur. Oportet enim omni prorsus castitate sacerdotem ornatum esse: "St. Paul," saith he, "required this, not in consideration that the same be now observed in the church. For it behoveth a bishop to be garnished with all manner of chastity."

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here cometh M. Harding in aloft with *Io Triumphe*, as having beaten down all the world under his feet: and as being already in sure possession of the victory, he crieth out: "impudencies," "lewd lies," "foul faults," and "pretty fittens:" and full terribly chargeth us, like a conqueror, to render ourselves, and to "recant for shame." This new courage is suddenly blown upon him, for that he thinketh we have intruded upon his office, and, as he saith, have corrupted and falsified the holy fathers. But it were a worthy matter to know wherein. Forsooth we say, by the report of Sozomenus and Gregorius Nazianzenus, that Spiridion, and Gregory, father unto Nazianzen, being both *married bishops*, notwithstanding their marriage, *were never the worse* able to do their ecclesiastical offices, but *rather the better*.

Here M. Harding of himself and freely confesseth, these holy fathers were *never the worse* able to do their offices. For so much the words of Sozomenus report: οὐδὲν τὰ θεῖα χείρων. But that they were *the better* able to do their offices, because of their wives, that he denieth utterly: and herein he saith: "We are corrupters and falsifiers of the fathers." And thus the whole difference that is between M. Harding and us, touching this matter, standeth only in these two poor words, *rather the better*, and *never the worse*.

Now, gentle reader, that thou mayest be the better able to judge between us, I beseech thee indifferently to weigh these words.

Gregory Nazianzen hereof, that is, of the help that his father, being the bishop of Nazianzum, had by his wife, writeth thus: *Illa quæ data est Adamo*, &c.: "Eva that was given to Adam for an helper, forasmuch as it was not good for man to be alone, instead of a helper, became his enemy." It followeth: *Meo autem patri, mater mea data*

Nazianzen.
in Epitaphio
Patris. [i.
335.]

... ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰlli a Deo, non tantum adjutrix facta est, id enim minus
 ἀρχηγὸς γί- esset mirum, sed etiam dux et princeps, verbo factoque indu-
 νεται, ἔργω cens illum ad res optimas. Et aliis quidem in rebus quamvis
 τε καὶ λόγῳ optimum esset subditam esse viro, propter jura conjugii,
 πρὸς τὰ κράτιστα δι' αὐτῆς ἄ- tamen in pietate non verebatur seipsam illi magistram exhi-
 γουσα... bere: "My mother being given to my father of God,
 τῆς εὐσε- became not only his helper, for that had been no great
 βείας οὐκ' wonder, but also was his leader and captain, both by word
 αἰσχύνω- and by deed, training him unto the best. And albeit in
 μέν τι παρέ- other things it were best for her to be subject unto her
 χεῖν ἑαυτὴν husband, for the right of marriage, yet in religion and
 καὶ διδά- godliness she doubteth not to become his mistress."

διδάσκαλος.

These words, M. Harding, be plain and clear, and with-
 out fitten. Gregory Nazianzen saith, that his own mother
 was unto his father, the bishop of Nazianzum, "a helper
 and a director, both by word and deed, to lead him to the
 best:" and that in all other things being his inferior, yet
 in "religion and godliness she was his mistress." And
 yet must all these words, *so open, so plain, so clear*, be
 drowned with your simple distinction of *rather the better*,
 and *never the worse*? May we not now allow you with
 favour to take all these that ye call "fittens," "lies,"
 "corruptions," "and falsifyings," home again unto your-
 self?

If you never read these things before, it is no great
 marvel. You must remember, All truth may not be
 measured by your reading.

M. Harding,
 fol. 313 a.
 313 b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "How make you not all *Addition.*
 men witnesses of your falsehood and impudency?.....The
 store of your note-books which Illyricus, friar Bale, and
 certain others of that cut have made to your hand.....You
 allege out of Gregory Nazianzen,.....that his mother was
 to his father "an helper, a guide, a leader, a captain, by
 word and by deed, training him to the best:" yea further,
 "that in religion and godliness she was not ashamed to
 become his mistress." All this is true, M. Jewel, I con-
 fess: and yet it proveth not your purpose at all. How so?
 Mark, reader, and consider of it well, how M. Jewel beguileth
 thee. Here lieth the deceit, in that he maketh St. Gregory,

Nazianzen's father, bishop of Nazianzum, when he had such help of his mother, &c. It is a weak flock, they say, of sheep, where an ewe beareth the bell, &c. Thus then is it. Gregory the elder, St. Gregory Nazianzen's father, was a married man long before he was a bishop: and before he was married to his wife, and also long after, he was an infidel. She, St. Gregory's mother, contrariwise was a Christian woman, born of Christian parents, &c. Hereby it is made clear to all men, how his father was holpen by his wife, not as being a bishop, as M. Jewel doth untruly say, but as yet being an infidel." *The answer.* It is true indeed. Nazianzen uttereth these things as done by his mother before his father was converted. Therefore you say: "They pertain nothing to the time that followed afterward, when his father was a bishop." And why so, M. Harding? Is this your best logic of Louvain? or will you teach us to reason thus: "Gregory Nazianzen's wife was a helper unto him before his conversion: *ergo*, afterward she did not, or could not, help him?" But this is one of your greatest graces: whatsoever you imagine may serve you to any advantage, ye take it, and hold it as your own, either as sufficiently proved, because you speak it, or else as confessed by your adversary. Then you spread out your banner, and blow up your triumph, and make yourself merry. Nazianzen, declaring the time of his father's infidelity before his conversion, saith: "That his wife, being a Christian woman, watched, fasted, sang psalms, and prayed for her husband, and was careful for him." Will you therefore say, that after he was once converted, she gave all over, and watched, and fasted, and sang psalms, and prayed no more? Verily, as she prayed for her husband, so was she a helper to her husband, not only while he was an infidel, but also all the time of his life. And why not? what wanted there in her? good will or understanding? As touching good will, Nazianzen compareth her with Sarah, *the mother of all faithful women*: 1 Pet. iii. 6. and saith: "That in godliness she passed all others." Touching her skill and understanding, he saith: "As the sunbeams are fair and clear in the morning, and grow

brighter and warmer toward noon, even so my father's wife, shewing forth the pleasant first-fruits of godliness at the beginning, afterward shined out with greater light." Thus we see, her light and ability grew more and more, and increased daily. And therefore Nazianzen saith unto her in the end of the same oration: "You take it not well, mother, thus to be counselled at my hands. I blame you not. For you yourself have given counsel unto many, whom long time hath led to seek your wisdom." So saith St. Paul: "I beseech thee, faithful yoke-fellow," (by which words Ignatius⁷⁶, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius think he meant his wife,) "help those women that have laboured with me in the gospel." Thus did Gregory Nazianzen's wife: she was godly herself, and help others, both men and women, with her godly counsel. She converted her husband from infidelity: she converted others: she brought up her children in the fear of God: "Her husband gave her the charge in delivering his money unto the poor." And yet will you tell us, *that she was no helper to her husband?* or, *that her husband by her means was not the better able to do his office?* It shameth me, M. Harding, to see these follies. Whereas Nazianzen saith: "She was a helper to his father," he meaneth not only the time of his infidelity, but generally the whole course of all his life. Five and forty years he lived a bishop: and all that while she was his helper.

"A weak flock," you say, "where an ewe beareth the bell." This proverb might better become a sheep of Cots-wold with his bell. For then the help that we speak of importeth no such sovereignty, *nor bearing of bells*. God himself saith: "Let us make Adam a helper meet for him." This helper was his wife Eva. Yet did not Eva *bear the bell*. St. Paul saith: "Salute you Priscilla, and Aquila her husband, that are my helpers in Christ Jesu." And, Phillpp. iv. 3, as I have alleged before, he saith to his own wife: "Help

[Nazianz.
Orat. 18. 1.
p. 362.]

Ignatius ad
Philadelph.
[Russel, ii.
128.]
Clemens
Stromatum
lib. 7. [leg.
lib. 3. tom. i.
535.]
Euseb. lib. 3.
cap. 30. [1.
124.]

Totas matri
habenas
dimisit.

Gen. ii. 18.

Rom. xvi. 3.

Phillpp. iv. 3.

⁷⁶ [In the larger edition of St. Ignatius' Epist. ad Philadelph. (Russel, tom. ii. p. 128.) St. Paul is spoken of as married; and Cotelerius attributes this opinion

to that father's misinterpretation of Phil. iv. 3; but throughout the epistle there is no express allusion to the words "faithful yoke-fellow."]

those women that have laboured with me in the gospel, together with Clemens, and others my helpers." Yet, I trow, ye will not say, that St. Paul shall come behind: or that Clemens, or Aquila, or Priscilla, or his own wife, or any other woman shall *bear the bell*. God said unto Abraham: "Hear the voice of Sarah thy wife, whatsoever she shall say to thee." She shall give thee good counsel: she shall help thee. Yet the sovereignty was in Abraham, and not in Sarah: neither was it Sarah, but Abraham that *bare the bell*. Gen. xxi. 12.

Thus to cavil at God's institution, M. Harding, was the manner of the old condemned heretics, Marcion, Valentinus, Tatius, and such others, in whose steps you cannot tread without great danger.

To be short, the resolution hereof is this: *Better it is to marry, than to swelter inwardly with filthy affections*. St. Paul saith: "I would wish all men to be as I am myself. But every man hath his gift:" one of *chastity*, and another of *marriage*. Though chastity be a singular gift of God, yet is it not good for him, that hath not the gift of chastity. St. Augustine saith: *Aliquando hoc expedit, aliquando illud. Nam illis qui se non continent, utique expedit nubere*: "Sometime chastity is good, sometime marriage. But to them that contain not," (that is to say, that have not the gift of chastity,) "it is better to marry." Howbeit, in such as have vowed chaste life, he saith: "It is neither lawful to marry, nor expedient." But alas, what availeth a vow of chaste life without chastity? 

Indeed marriage, as also other like outward things, of itself is neither good nor ill, but as it is used. St. Paul saith: "If the virgin marry, she sinneth not. He that marrieth out his virgin, sinneth not." Therefore Gregory Nazianzen saith: *Neutrum horum, nec matrimonium, nec cœlebs vita prorsus aut Deo nos, mundove conciliat: aut a Deo, aut a mundo alienat: ut alterum natura sua omnino fugiendum sit, alterum absolute laudandum. Animus est, qui et virginitati, et nuptiis recte imperat*: "Neither of these two, nor matrimony, nor single life, doth either join us to God, or to the world: or withdraw us from God, or 1 Cor. vii. 28.
Nazianzen.
in Epitaphio
Gorgoniae.
... μήθ' ἕτε-
ρον τούτων
ἢ θεῷ πάν-
τως, ἢ κό-
σμῳ συνδεῖ,
καὶ διίστησι
πρόσθιν....
Ονοῦς ἐστὶν
ὁ καὶ γάμῳ
καὶ παρθενίᾳ
καλῶς ἐπι-
στατῶν.

from the world: that the one ought to be refused, and the other absolutely, and of itself, ought to be praised. *It is the mind, that ruleth both marriage and virginity.*"

I grant, there be no occasions of let and hinderance in matrimony than in virginity, and specially in times of persecution. The natural affection of wife and children often mollifieth and melteth the heart, and causeth a man to look backward.

Ambros. de
Virginitate,
lib. 3. [cap.
6. tom. ii.
221.]

St. Ambrose saith: *Bona vincula nuptiarum: sed tamen vincula: etsi vincula, tamen vincula charitatis: bonum conjugium: sed tamen a jugo tractum:* "Good are the bands of matrimony: yet are they bands. And although they be bands, yet are they *bands of charity*. *Conjugium* (wedlock) is good, yet it taketh his name of the yoke."

This is that tribulation of the flesh that St. Paul speaketh of.

And albeit these cares withdraw and oppress the mind, as I have said, and oftentimes be great lets to godly purposes; yet, as it well appeareth by these examples of Gregory Nazianzen and Spiridion, in a godly man they hinder nothing. Neither was this any such singular privilege as M. Harding imagineth, granted only to these two bishops, Gregory and Spiridion, and to none other.

Chrysost. in
1 Epist. ad
Tim. hom. 10.
[xi. 599.]

St. Chrysostom saith, not only generally of all men, but also specially of priests and bishops: *Quamvis nuptiæ plurimum difficultatis in se habeant, ita tamen assumi possunt, ut perfectiori vitæ impedimento non sint:* "Notwithstanding marriage have much trouble in itself, yet may it so be taken" (and used), "that it shall be no hinderance to perfect life⁷⁷." Again he saith: *Ne excuses te propter nuptias: Dominus tuus nuptiis interfuit, et nuptias cohonestavit. Et tu nuptias arguis? et dicis nuptias esse impedimentum ad pietatem? Nullum enim ad pietatem est obstaculum. Vis cognoscere, quod nihil obsit habere uxorem et liberos? Moses*

Chrysost.
contra Ju-
dæos et Gen-
tiles et He-
ræticos, tom.
iii. p. 363. [1.
821. inter
spuria.]

⁷⁷ [The Editor is not confident that this reference has been correctly verified. The Greek does not correspond with the Latin translation. There seems in the page indicated to be a passage re-

sembling the quotation in the text. See this passage handled, infra p. 456 (fol. ed. 1609), in reply to Harding's cavils in his Detection, fol. 305 a.]

*nonne uxorem habuit et liberos?.....Vide et Petrum colum-
nam ecclesiæ, quod et ipse uxorem habuit. Ne accuses
nuptias: "Excuse not thyself by thy marriage. Thy Lord
was at the marriage feast, and honoured marriage with his
presence. And yet doest thou blame marriage? and sayest
thou that marriage is an hinderance unto godliness? I tell
thee, Marriage is no manner hinderance unto godliness.
Wilt thou know that it hindereth not to have wife and chil-
dren? had not Moses wife and children? Behold Peter, a
pillar of the church, he had a wife. Therefore find no
fault with marriage."*

Again, writing upon these words of the prophet Esay, *Vidi* Chrysost. in
Esaia, in illa
verba, Vidi
Dominum,
tom. i. hom.
4. [vi. 123.] *Dominum, &c. he saith thus: Quis ista loquitur? Esaias
ille spectator cælestium seraphim, qui cum conjuge [al. conju-
gio] commercium habuit, nec tamen extinxit gratiam: "Who
speaketh these words? Esaias the beholder of the celestial
seraphims, who, notwithstanding he had company with his
wife, yet he quenched not the grace of God⁷⁸." Again:
Filiū habebat, et uxorem: ut intelligas non esse malas
nuptias, sed malam esse scortationem: "Esay had a son,
and a wife: that thou mayest understand, that marriage is
not ill, but that fornication is ill." And again: Num ob-
stabat matrimonium? Adjutrix tibi data est uxor, non insi-
diatrix: "What, did marriage hinder thee? No. Thy wife
is given to thee to be thy helper, and not to deceive thee."*

Likewise saith St. Augustine: *Sanctissimus Samuel filios* Augustin. in
quæstionibus
Novi et Vet.
Testamen.
quæst. 127.
[iii. app. 142.] *genuit: non tamen justitiæ suæ merita minuit:.....Zacha-
rias sacerdos, vir justus, in senectute sua genuit filium.....
Qua ergo ratione accusatur, quod minime obesse probatur?*
"Most holy Samuel begat children: and yet nothing abated
the merits of his righteousness. Zacharias the priest in his
old age begat a child. Wherefore then is that thing ac-
cused, that is proved to do no manner hurt⁷⁹?"

Nicephorus writing of Gregory, St. Basil's brother, the
bishop of Nyssa, saith thus: *Quamvis haberet conjugem,* Niceph. lib.
ii. cap. 19.
[ii. 137.] *aliis tamen in rebus non cessit fratri: "Although he had*

⁷⁸ [Chrysost. in Esaia: τίς χάριν οὐ σβέσας.]

ταυτὰ φησιν; Ἡσαίας ὁ θεωρὸς τῶν
Σεραφείμ, ὁ γάμψ ὁμιλήσας, καὶ τὴν

⁷⁹ [This work is not genuine.]

a wife, yet in other things he was *nothing inferior to* (St. Basil) *his brother.*"

Augustin. de
Bono Con-
jug. cap. 11.
[vi. 327.]

St. Augustine saith, as he is alleged before : *Sancta sunt etiam corpora conjugatorum fidem sibi et Domino servantium* : "Where married people keep their faith both to themselves, and to God, *their bodies be holy.*"

Nazianzen.
in Funer.
Gorgon. [i.
222.]

Likewise Nazianzen : *Etiam illa quæ nupsit, et de iis quæ sunt mariti, et de iis quæ sunt Domini, sollicita est, ut sit sancta, et corpore, et spiritu* : "Even she that is married is careful both for the things that pertain to her husband, and also for the things that pertain to God, that she may be *holy both in body and spirit.*"

Ambros. in 1
Cor. vii. [ii.
app. 137.]

Likewise St. Ambrose : *Videmus virgines de sæculo cogitare : et matrimonio junctos Dominicis studere operibus* : "We see both virgins careful for the world : and married men careful for the works of the Lord⁸⁰."

There be troubles in marriage : it cannot be denied. But so be there also troubles in single life : specially to them that fear the judgments of God, and have not the gift of chastity.

Chrysost. in
Gen. hom. 21.
[iv. 186.]

But Chrysostom saith : *Matrimonium non solum nihil nobis obstat ad philosophandum Deo, si voluerimus esse sobrii, sed et magnam adfert consolationem : comprimit enim insanum naturæ impetum : nec turbari sinit, quasi mare : sed efficit ut scapha feliciter in portum appellat. Et ideo Deus consolationem hanc tribuit humano generi* : "Marriage not only *hindereth nothing* towards the knowledge and service of God, if we will be sober, *but also bringeth us great comfort.* For it oppresseth the raging fury of nature, and suffereth us not to be dashed and tossed as the waves of the sea : but causeth that our ship may luckily arrive into the haven. And for that cause hath God given *this comfort* unto mankind."

Nazianzen.
in Funere
Gorgoniae. [i.
222.]
διὰ τῆς ἐν
γάμῳ εὐα-
ρεστησεως.

Therefore Gregory Nazianzen saith : *Nuptiæ sunt laudabiles propter eam, quæ in nuptiis est, animi tranquillitatem* : "Marriage is worthy of praise, for the *quietness and contentation of mind* that is in marriage."

⁸⁰ [This work is not by St. Ambrose.]

To be short, Clemens Alexandrinus saith: *Habet, ut* Clemens Stromat. lib. 3. [l. 546.] *castitas, ita etiam matrimonium, propria munera et ministeria, quæ ad Dominum pertinent*: “As well matrimony, as also chastity, hath either of them their peculiar offices pertaining unto God⁸¹.”

And Chrysostom saith: *Ne quis prætexat uxorem, vel liberos, &c. hæc excusatio, hic prætextus, diaboli sunt insidiæ*: “Let no man make his excuse by his wife, or children, &c. *This excuse and this pretence is the craft and deceitfulness of the devil.*” Thus, M. Harding, to conclude with Chrysostom’s words, the ground and foundation of your doctrine in this behalf “is the craft and deceitfulness of the devil.”

These things considered, I doubt not, but of your courtesy ye will take back your fittons unto yourself. The conclusion and sum of your whole talk is this: *Spiridion served God never the worse, notwithstanding he had a wife: and marriage is no let or hinderance to perfect godliness.*

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. Divis. 3.

Further we say, that the same law which by constraint taketh away this liberty from men, and compelleth them against their wills to live single, is the doctrine of devils, as Paul saith: and, that ever sithence the time of this law, a wonderful uncleanness of life and manners in God’s ministers, and sundry horrible enormities have followed, as the bishop of Augusta, as Faber, as Abbas Panormitanus, as Latomus, as the Tripartite work, which is annexed to the second tome of the Councils, and other champions of the pope’s hand, yea, and as the matter itself and all histories do confess.

For it was rightly said by Pius the Second, bishop of Rome, that “he saw many causes why wives

⁸¹ [Clemens. Stromat. ἔχει γὰρ ἰδίᾳς λειτουργίας καὶ διακονίας τῷ ὡσπερ ἡ εὐνουχία, οὕτω καὶ ὁ γάμος Κυρίῳ διαφερούσας.]

should be taken away from priests : but that he saw many mo, and more weighty causes, why they ought to be restored to them again."

M. HARDING.

a Manifest
untruth. For
all priests
are restrain-
ed from
marriage.
And priests
be men.

There is a no law in the church, that by constraint taketh away from men liberty to marry. For St. Paul's words be plain : " If thou take a wife, thou sinnest not." And likewise : " If a virgin marry, she sinneth not." But if any persons have of their own will and devotion vowed to God chastity, the same have imbarred themselves of this general liberty, and by their voluntary promise have bound themselves never to marry. And in such, not only marriage itself, but also a will to marry is damnable, as St. Paul saith of widows which have vowed to live chaste, " that they have their damnation" (not for that they marry, but) " for that they will marry." If the gossellers allege against this doctrine the words of St. Paul, " If a virgin marry she sinneth not:" we answer with Chrysostom and other fathers, " that a virgin by a vow of chastity dedicated to God, if she marry, doubtless she sinneth much, for that beside Christ she hath sur-married an adulterer." If they object, " It is better to marry than to burn:" let St. Ambrose answer, who saith : " that this saying pertaineth to her that hath not promised, to her that is not yet veiled⁸²."... And by restraining them from marriage, the church useth no tyranny : nor, if it teach that such ought to forbear marriage, is that to be accounted the doctrine of devils, but of the Holy Ghost, whereby men are kept from wilful damnation. To forbid marriage wholly, universally, and altogether, that is the doctrine of devils. But to judge marriage for some state and order of less convenience than the single life, or after vow of chastity made, to require perpetual continency, this is not the doctrine of devils. For St. Paul himself did both. If these defenders will not admit this answer, and being loath to forsake their fleshly pleasure, pretend to be moved with the authority of St. Paul, who calleth the forbidding of marriage the doctrine of devils : I send them to St. Augustine for an answer, in his thirtieth book and sixth chapter against Faustus the Manichee. Where, for a sufficient solution of their objection, they shall find these plain words : *Ille prohibet, qui hoc malum esse dicit : non qui huic* [Augustin. Opp. tom. viii. 448.]

⁸² [Jewel ought to have gone on with the quotation from St. Ambrose : " but as for her which hath promised herself to Christ, and hath taken the holy veil, she is already wedded, she is coupled to an immortal husband. And being in this case, if she will wed after

the common law of wedlock, she committeth adultery, she is made the handmaid of death : " for this wedlock (continues Harding) is far more excellent than the corruptible wedlock, saith Nazianzen, &c.]

bono aliud melius anteponit: that is to say, "He forbiddeth (marriage) which saith it is evil: not he which preferreth another better thing before this good thing.".....

Now that I may shew in what time, and by what persons, this law of single life was ordained, for brevity's sake, I will content myself with witness of one only council, which is the second council of Carthage, holden in the time of Valentinian and Theodosius the emperors. Where we find that this order was taken ^b by the apostles themselves, and that the antiquity observed and kept the same. The words of the council be these, can. 2.

Aurelius episcopus dixit, &c.: "Aurelius the bishop said: Whereas in the council before this, it was treated of the rule of continency and chastity, these three degrees through their consecrations be annexed to chastity by a certain decree written, to wit, bishops, priests, and deacons: whom it is thought good, as it becometh the holy prelates and priests of God, and likewise Levites, or such as attend upon holy sacraments, to be continent and chaste in every condition, to the intent they may simply obtain that they pray to God for, that we keep and observe that which ^c the apostles have taught, and the antiquity hath kept." Lo, sir defender.....

What if the bishop of Augusta find fault with priests' lives? (Which Augusta, and which bishop there ye mean I know not, neither well can I know, except I saw your note-book.) What if the abbot Panormitane, what if one Faber, and one Latomus, men of our time (I trow), and that zealous man which wrote the little tripartite treatise annexed to the Lateran council, whatsoever he was: what if all these, I say, moved with a zeal, and being desirous of the clergy's reformation, lamentably complain of their loose life? What then?.....

Get you fairer painted and better filled boxes than these be, or else shall ye all be taken for poor pothecaries.....

.....Touching Pius, in Platina ye shall find these words for one of that pope's sayings: *Sacerdotibus magna ratione sublatis nuptias, majori restituendas videri*: as much to say in English, "that marriage was taken from priests with great reason, and that it seemed it were to be restored again with greater." This saying reporteth not, that wives were taken away from priests, as you report, neither that wives ought to be restored to priests again. ^d It speaketh only of marriage, which, as before a man enter into holy orders, no vow being made, is lawful: so by orders taken, a vow of chastity being solemnly made, is utterly unlawful. If this saying had made so much for your pretended marriage, as ye would men to believe, ^e ye would never have falsified it by such change of words. Whether it be more expedient, such as come to the clergy, to be required to lead the single life, and to bind themselves thereto by vows, or to enjoy the common liberty of marriage, ^f that we leave to the church to discuss an order.....

^b Untruth.
For these be the words of the Apostles' Canons: *Episcopus, aut presbyter, aut diaconus, uxorem suam prætectu religionis ne abjiciat. Aut si abjecerit, a communione segregetur.* can. 5.

^c Untruth: read the answer. M. Harding foully mistaketh the council.

^d A sage exposition. What had this been to Pius? meaning?

^e Untruth. For if we had falsified the words, ye would not so simply have touched it.

^f Now at last the doctors stand in doubt.

g Mira vero
militi quæ
placeant.

If Pius saw many weightier causes for priests to have wives than for their single life, as ye pretend he did : why did not he, or you in his stead, shew us what and how substantial they be ? If they be no better than you and your fellows have uttered in your sermons and writings hitherto, they are not worth g a pipt nut. This saying of Pius is well to be weighed and scanned....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Whosoever shall well consider the fruits that have grown of this tree, may easily judge by whom it was planted. Certainly St. Paul, when he had given rules touching the clergy, that bishops and deacons should be the husbands of one wife, immediately afterward, in the same tenour and course of speech, saith thus : "The Spirit saith plainly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving ear unto lying spirits, and to the doctrine of devils, uttering lies under hypocrisy, having their conscience burnt with a hot iron," (and thereby made unsensible,) "*forbidding marriage*," &c. Here we are taught by the Spirit of God, that *forbidding of marriage is the doctrine of devils*.

1 Tim. iv.
[1-3.]

But M. Harding saith : "There is no law in the church to restrain marriage : and that marriage is not now condemned by him, and others of that side, and thought unlawful universally in all men," (for that, he saith, was the heresy of Valentinus, Marcion, Montanus, and others,) "but only forbidden and thought unlawful in a few." By this answer M. Harding may seem to make himself somewhat better than was Valentinus, and Marcion, and other old heretics. But further to help him, and thoroughly to clear his doctrine, it will not serve. It is a common known rule in the schools, *Magis et minus non mutant speciem*. Verily, as he that killeth but a few men is called a man-killer : even so he that condemneth marriage in a few, must likewise be called a condemner of marriage. Neither doth St. Paul, when he prophesieth hereof, say, that some should condemn all kind of marriage universally in all manner of men, but only he saith : "There shall be some that shall forbid marriage : " as the bishops of Rome have done.

Neither did all heretics condemn marriage in one sort. For some of them condemned it generally, and thoroughly, and altogether : some others of them condemned it only in a few, even as M. Harding and his fellows do. For thus St. Augustine writeth of the heretics named the Manichees :

Auditores qui appellantur apud eos, et carnibus vescuntur, et agros colunt, et, si voluerint, uxores habent. Quorum nihil faciunt illi qui vocantur electi : “ They that among them be called the hearers, do both eat flesh, and till the ground, and marry wives too if they list. But no such thing may they do that be called *electi*.” The *auditors* or *hearers* among the Manichees were as the lay-people : the *electi* or *chosen* were as the clergy. These heretics the Manichees condemned marriage, not generally in all sorts and degrees of men : but only, as M. Harding doth, in a few. Yet were they heretics notwithstanding, and their doctrine was *the doctrine of devils*.

St. Augustine saith unto them, as he would also say unto M. Harding : *Non concubitus, sed, ut longe ante ab apostolo dictum est, vere nuptias prohibetis :* “ Ye forbid not copulation” (or concubines), “ but even as the apostle prophesied long before, *verily and indeed ye forbid marriage :*” (albeit it were but in a few.)

All this, M. Harding, notwithstanding, that it may plainly appear, whose doctrine ye teach, it shall be good, and not from the purpose, briefly to disclose some part of it. And

here to pass over these words of Chrysostom : *Hæc ipsa conjunctio maritalis malum est ante Deum :* “ This very copulation of man and wife is *evil before God :*” and these

of St. Hierom : *Quamdiu impleo mariti officium, non impleo officium Christiani* [Ben. leg. continentis] : “ As long as I do the duty of a husband, *I do not the duty of a Christian :*”

and other like sayings and authorities before alleged : Pope Innocentius in the condemnation of marriage saith thus : *Qui in carne sunt, Deo placere non possunt :* “ They that be in the flesh” (that is to say, in marriage) “ *cannot please God.*” And to this purpose he allegeth these words

of St. Paul : “ To the clean all things are clean : *but to the filthy and infidels* (whereby the same pope Innocentius

Augustin.
epist. 74.
[li. 848.]

Augustin. de
Morib. Mani-
chæ. lib. 2.
cap. 18. [l.
739.]

Chrysostom.
in Opere Im-
perfecto,
hom. 1. [tom.
vi. app. 24.]

Hieron. ad-
versus Jovi-
nian. lib. 1.
[lv. pt. ii.
150.]

Dist. 82.
Proposuiti.
Rom. viii. 8.

Tit. 1. 15.

understandeth married people) *nothing is clean: but both their mind and their conscience is defiled.*" Pope Siricius calleth marriage: *Vitium, luxuriam, fædas cupiditates: Vice, lechery, and filthy lusts.*" One of your late English doctors of Louvain saith: that the whole *east church*, maintaining the lawful marriage of priests, evermore continued there from the apostles' time until this day, maintaineth and continueth a school of filthiness.

Further you may remember, that this rule is written in a book of your own doctrine, and is given in secret, as a special lesson unto your clergy: *Si non caste, tamen caute: "If thou deal not chastely, yet deal charily."*

From whence had you this doctrine, M. Harding? who set it first abroad? who taught it? who confirmed it? who allowed it? If ye can say, it is not *the doctrine of the devil*, yet verily, I believe, ye cannot say, it is in any point like *the doctrine of God*. St. Hierom having occasion to speak of Antichrist, saith thus: *Simulabit castitatem, ut plurimos decipiat*: "He shall make a counterfeit show of chastity, that he may deceive many." Even so St. Paul saith: *Habentes speciem pietatis: virtutem autem ejus abnegantes*: "Having a colour of godliness: but the power thereof denying utterly."

But, somewhat to relieve yourself, ye allege these words of St. Augustine: *Ille prohibet matrimonium, qui illud malum esse dicit: non qui huic bono aliud melius anteponit*: "He forbiddeth marriage, that saith marriage is evil: and not he that before this thing, being good, setteth another thing that is better." Here, M. Harding, I beseech you of your indifferent judgment: he that useth your words, and saith, as you say: "They that live in matrimony cannot please God: they be filthy: they be infidels: unto them nothing is clean: their whole mind and conscience is defiled:" he that saith: "Matrimony is *vice, lechery, and filthy pleasure*:" saith he not, "Matrimony is an evil thing?" Thus you say: thus you write: these words be apparent and allowed in your books: even in those books whereby ye would have us to order and to direct our lives and manners. Briefly, this is the very substance of your

Copius Dial.
1. p. 159.
Græcos solos
in hac impu-
ditiæ scho-
la magistros
sequuntur.

Const. Otho-
nis. [de con-
cub. Cleric.
removendis.]
Licet ad pro-
fugandum.
In Glossa.

Hieron. in
Danielem,
cap. 11. [iii.
1131.]

2 Tim. iii. 5.

Augustin.
contra Faust.
lib. 30. cap.
6. [viii. 448.]

doctrine in this behalf. Therefore even by St. Augustine's judgment, *your doctrine is the doctrine of devils.*

And whereas ye would seem not utterly to condemn the state of matrimony, *but only to set single life before it, as a better thing before a good*: it may please you to understand, that notwithstanding a thing in itself be best, yet is it not therefore universally best for every man. For notwithstanding scarlet be the fairest of all colours, and the face the fairest part of all the body, yet I reckon, M. Harding, to make yourself fair, ye would not have your face dyed in scarlet.

Single life for many causes is the best: I grant. Yet is it not best for everybody: but only for him that hath the gift of chastity, and can with quiet mind and upright conscience live single. Otherwise matrimony is much better. And therefore God hath left us indifferently free to both: that whosoever cannot use the one, may choose the other. St. Paul saith: *Volo omnes esse sicut meipsum*: "I 1 Cor. vii. 7. would every man would live single, as I do." But he addeth withal a small proviso: *Unusquisque proprium donum habet a Deo: alius sic, alius autem sic*: "Every man hath his own gift of God: one this, another that."

And therefore he saith further: Although single life be the better state, "yet whosoever is not continent, let him marry. Better it is to marry than to burn." Although otherwise he weigh single life before marriage, yet in this case he saith, it is better to marry than so to live single.

M. Harding hereto replieth: "They that have vowed have lost this liberty: and by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine's judgment, may not marry." Hereof I have partly spoken before: and partly shall have occasion offered to say more hereafter. In the mean season we are taught here by M. Harding to take St. Paul's words by the top, and to turn them quite backward: and thus to frame a new rule of life, and to say, contrary to St. Paul: *Melius est uri, quam nubere*: "It is better to burn in concupiscence, than to marry."

Yet St. Augustine saith, even of them that have vowed, as it is before alleged: *Qui nubere volunt, et ideo non* Augustin. de Sancta Virginitat. cap. 34. [viii. 357.]

nubunt, quia impune non possunt, melius nuberent, quam urerentur, id est, quam occulta flamma concupiscentiæ in ipsa conscientia vastarentur..... : “They that have a mind to marry, and yet marry not, because they cannot marry without reproach, ‘better were it for them to marry than to burn :’ that is to say, than with the privy flame of their concupiscence to be wasted in their conscience.”

Further M. Harding saith : “This order of single life was taken by the apostles themselves : and therefore,” saith he, “it is not the devil’s, but the apostles’ doctrine.” If this be true indeed, then is this matter thoroughly concluded. But where was this order taken by the apostles ? By what writing, by what record, by what tradition may it appear ? or how is it likely that the apostles, being married men themselves, would force other men to live single ?

† Ambros.
2 Cor. xi.
[ii. app. 198.]
Euseb. lib. 3.
cap. 27. [i.
125.]
ὡ αὕτη μέμ-
νησο τοῦ
κυρίου.
Ignatius ad
Philadeph.
[ed. Russel.
ii. 128.]

I have already shewed by Ignatius, by Clemens, by Eusebius, and by St. Ambrose, that the apostles, St. John only excepted, were all married. Clemens saith, that Peter saw his own wife carried by the officers to suffer death for Christ’s sake : and cried unto her comfortably by her name : “O woman, remember the Lord.” Ignatius, St. John’s disciple, saith : *Opto Deo dignus inveniri,.....sicut Petrus, et Paulus, et reliqui apostoli, qui nuptiis fuerunt sociati, qui non libidinis causa, sed posteritatis surrogandæ gratia conjuges habuerunt* : “I wish to be found meet for God, as was Peter, and Paul, and the other apostles that were married : and not for pleasure, but for posterity’s sake had wives.”

Chrysost. in
Priorem ad
Tim. hom.
ro. [xi. 600.]

Chrysostom saith : *Cur non ait, Oportet episcopum angelum esse, nulli humanæ perturbationi, vitiove subjectum ? Ne ecclesiæ negotia, fructusque perirent. Idcirco moderatam virtutem proposuit : non supremam illam, atque cœlestem*⁸³ ? “Why saith not St. Paul, *A bishop ought to be an angel*, subject neither to any worldly affection, nor to any vice ? Lest the affairs and fruits of the church should perish” (being without a governor). “Therefore he re-

⁸³ [Chrysost. in 1 Tim. μένην εἶπεν ἀρετὴν, οὐκ ἐκείνην τὴν ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐνεδρεύεσθαι ἔμελλε τὰ τῶν ἄνω, τὴν ὑψηλὴν.]
ἐκκλησιῶν, διὰ τοῦτο συµµετρη-

quired of bishops *a moderate and a reasonable kind of virtue*" (willing them to be husbands of one wife), "and not that other virtue, so high, and so heavenly:" (that is to say, utterly to live unmarried.)

Again he saith: *Idcirco ait, Unius uxoris virum :.....ne nimis in angustum rem eam concluderet, si exactissimam virtutem expetisset: idcirco moderatiori admonitione maluit uti: ne ex desperatione perfectæ illius inveniendæ virtutis, ecclesiæ sine episcopis essent*⁸⁴: "Therefore St. Paul saith, *Let a bishop be the husband of one wife*: lest he should shut up the matter into too great a strait, if he had required that most perfect purity: therefore he would rather use a reasonable moderation or mean" (that a bishop should be the husband of one wife): "lest of despair of finding that excellency of virtue" (to live unmarried), "the churches should be left without bishops."

St. Paul saith: "Touching virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord:" "Better it is to marry than to burn:" "Let a bishop be the *husband of one wife*." Which last words pope Leo expoundeth thus: *.....is episcopus ordinetur, quem unius uxoris virum fuisse, aut esse constiterit*: ".....let him be consecrate a bishop of whom it may well appear, that either he *is, or hath been, the husband of one wife*⁸⁵."

St. Ambrose expounding these words of St. Paul, "Touching virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord," saith thus: *Si doctor Gentium non habuit, habere quis potuit?* "If the doctor of the Gentiles had no commandment of the Lord touching virgins, what man else then could ever have it?"

Among the rules which commonly are called the *Apostles' Canons*, it is written thus: *Episcopus, aut presbyter, aut diaconus, uxorem suam prætextu religionis ne abjiciat: aut si abjecerit, a communione segregetur: et si perseveret, deponatur*: "Let not either bishop, or priest, or deacon, put

⁸⁴ [Ibid. διὰ τοῦτο συµµε-
µετρομένην ἐζήτησεν ἀρετὴν ἐδει-
γὰρ καθίστασθαι καθ' ἐκάστην πόλιν
τὸν προηγούμενον.]

⁸⁵ [Leo. ep. 87. "Dicente enim
apostolo ut... is episcopus or-
dinetur," &c.]

Chrysost. in
eadem Hom.
[xl. 601.]

1 Tim. iii. 2.
Tit. i. 6.
Leo, epist.
87. [l. 401.]

Ambros. [de
Virg. lib. i.
tom. ii. 152.]

Can. 5. [al. 6.]

away his wife under colour of religion. Or if he so do, let him be put from the communion" (of the faithful): "and if he so continue, let him be utterly deposed from his office."

Hieron. contra Jovinian. lib. 1. [iv. pt. 2. p. 154.]

St. Hierom expounding these words of St. Paul, "Let every man remain in the vocation wherein he was called," saith thus: *Ex hoc,.....habentibus uxores tollit licentiam dimittendi eas*: ".....hereby St. Paul forbiddeth married men to put away their wives."

Dist. 31. Quoniam.

In the sixth council holden at Constantinople it is written thus: *Antiquum sequentes canonem apostolicæ diligentia, et constitutiones sanctorum virorum, legales nuptias posthac valere volumus, nullo modo cum uxoribus suis eorum concubia dissolventes*: "Following the old order of the apostles' diligence, and the constitutions and laws of the holy fathers, from henceforth we will, that *the lawful marriage*" (of bishops and priests) "shall stand in force, *not in any wise dissolving the wedlock that they have with their wives.*" And herein they say they follow the old canon, or order of the apostles.

26. quest. 2. Sors.

Gratian saith, as he is before alleged: *Copula sacerdotalis nec legali, nec evangelica, nec apostolica autoritate prohibetur*: "The marriage of priests is not forbidden by any authority, either of the law, or of the gospel, or of the apostles."

Catharinus contra errores Cajetani, error. 112. [p. 241.]

Cardinal Cajetan saith: *Dominus discipulis suis nullum indixit votum*: "Our Lord appointed unto his disciples *no manner of vow.*"

Clem. Strom. lib. 3. [i. 550.]

Clemens Alexandrinus saith, as it is said before: *Epistolæ apostoli.....nusquam honestum moderatumque matrimonium prohibuerunt*: "The epistles of Paul the apostle never forbad honest and sober marriage."

All these things well considered, I beseech thee, gentle reader, indifferently to weigh M. Harding's words: and to demand of him, with what countenance he could thus tell thee, that the order of single life was taken *by the apostles themselves*, and therefore must be holden as the *apostles' doctrine*.

If he happen to tell thee, *It is written in the council of*

Carthage: tell him again, he is deceived. I say, tell him, that the apostles of Christ never, neither made any law, nor gave any order for the single life of the ministers. And therefore tell him hardly, he is deceived. He will say, The words of the council be plain: *Quod apostoli docuerunt et ipsa servavit antiquitas*: “Which thing the apostles have taught, and the antiquity itself hath observed.” These words be plain indeed: if they were not perversely glossed. Therefore tell him again, he should better have learned, both the manner of the apostles’ teaching, and also the scope and reach of this antiquity. Certainly thus much his own Gloss could have told him: *Apostoli nihil instituerunt, de non utendo matrimonio jam contracto*: “The apostles took no order, touching the not using of matrimony already contracted.”

Concil. Carthag. 2. cap. 2. [iii. 693.]

Dist. 84. Cum in præterito. In Glossa.

And whereas the council saith: *Apostoli docuerunt*: “The apostles taught:” the same Gloss saith: *Apostoli docuerunt exemplo: non institutione, vel constitutione*: “The apostles taught it by their example: but not by appointment, nor by commandment.” Perhaps M. Harding will say: *The apostles’ example is sufficient*. Thereto I will answer, as Clemens Alexandrinus sometime answered certain of the old heretics in like case: *Dicunt gloriosi isti jactatores, se imitari Dominum, qui uxorem non duxit. Illis dicit scriptura, Deus superbis resistit: humilibus autem dat gratiam*: “These glorious braggers say, they will follow the example of our Lord, that married no wife. Unto them the scripture saith: ‘God withstandeth the proud, and giveth grace unto the humble.’”

Clem. Strom. lib. 7. [leg. lib. 3. tom. 1. 533.]

And to like purpose St. Ambrose saith: *Præceptum quidem apostolus non habuit: at habuit exemplum*: “Indeed the apostle St. Paul had no commandment to give of virginity: but example he had to give.”

Ambros. de Virginibus, lib. 1. [ii. 152.]

Again, whereas the council allegeth antiquity, *quod ipsa servavit antiquitas*, the same Gloss expoundeth it thus: *A tempore Siricii papæ hic vocat antiquitatem*: “By this word antiquity, the council meaneth the time after pope Siricius (which was four hundred years after Christ).” And again,

as it is alleged before : *Ante tempora Siricii papæ, sacerdotes poterant contrahere matrimonium* : “ Before the time of pope Siricius, it was lawful for priests to contract matrimony.”

Such good luck M. Harding hath to his doctors and councils. By his own Gloss he hath lost four hundred years of his antiquity.

Extr. de Clericis conjugatis. Cum olim. [tom. iii. fol. 16. ed. 1586.]

Panormitane after he had said : “ The commandment of single life is not of the law of God :” he added further : *Quia alias Græci peccarent : non enim excusaret eos consuetudo. Quia illa non valet contra legem Dei* : “ Otherwise the Grecians were offenders. For no custom could excuse them : forasmuch as custom prevaieth not against the law of God.”

Sozomen. lib. 1. cap. 22. [al. 23. ii. 41.]

Now touching this council of Carthage, notwithstanding it had been truly construed, yet the authority thereof must needs seem so much the less, for that it decreeth of set purpose quite contrary to the council of Nice. For the fathers in the Nicene council durst not to remove priests and bishops from their wives : for that it was written : “ Whom God hath joined, let no man sunder.” But these other fathers in the council of Carthage, without any sticking or doubting of the matter, only with one word, utterly removed them : and so by force and violence, and contrary to the commandment of Christ, sundered and divided them, whom God had joined. Which thing, holy Paphnutius saith, “ was not lawful for man to do.”

Touching bishop Hulderichus, Panormitanus, Latomus, and Jacobus Faber, and such others as have spoken or written in the behalf of priests’ marriage, M. Harding thinketh it sufficient for him to answer : “ What if they complain of the loose life of the clergy ? what then ?” (that is to say) *What if the clergy live in professed shame, and open filthiness ?* what then ? as if such simple authorities were worthy of none other answer.

Yet was Hulderichus sometime bishop of Augusta in Germany, well near six hundred years ago, and for his virtue and holiness was counted a saint. Abbas Urspergensis in his story writeth of him in this sort : *Hiltinus*

Abbas. Ursperg. ann. 925. p. 214.

Augustanus episcopus obiit: cui Sanctus Udalrichus (qui idem est Hulderichus⁸⁶) successit: "Hiltine the bishop of Augusta died: to whom succeeded Saint Hulderichus." Abbas Panormitanus was a famous canonist, in judgment equal with any other.

Faber and Latomus both in our time were accounted learned: and either of them a special champion of M. Harding's side. Verily the worst and vilest of all these is a great deal both sounder in judgment and deeper in learning, than either Amphilocheus, whom M. Harding so highly esteemeth, or Abdias, or Hippolytus, or Leontius: whom they have lately raked out of the dust: or Clement of Rome, whom he so often calleth the apostles' fellow.

Neither did these writers only complain of the looseness of priests' lives, as M. Harding telleth us: but also for removing of public shame and slander out of the church of God, wished that the liberty of marriage might be restored: which thing M. Harding so closely dissembleth.

Touching that pope Pius was commonly wont to say: "As marriage was taken away from priests upon great considerations, even so now upon other greater considerations it were to be restored to them again:" M. Harding, after much other needless talk, saith thus: "Why did not he, or you in his stead, shew us, what and how substantial considerations they be?"

Good Christian reader, loath I am to disclose and publish any thing, that may sound to the shame of any one man: much less that may turn to the open shame of so great a number. But M. Harding over heavily presseth us with his importunity, and requireth us upon our credit to shew these causes. Therefore if the report hereof shall seem unpleasant, the fault is M. Harding's: it is not mine. I will only shew forth simply and truly, that I find written in sundry, both of the ancient learned fathers, and also in others of his own side: which nevertheless, had not M. Harding been, might much better have been concealed.

First of all, the ancient father Origen for his time, which

⁸⁶ [Abb. Ursperg. "Hiltine Augustensis," &c. The words between brackets are not in the original.]

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
24. [iii. 836.]

was well near fourteen hundred years ago, hereof complaineth thus: *Non solum, quæ docent, non faciunt, sed etiam crudeliter, et sine misericordia, non secundum æstimationem virium uniuscujusque.....injungunt: ut, qui prohibent nubere, et ab eo, quod expedit, ad immoderatam munditiam compellunt.....Alligant...onera gravia,.....et faciunt homines cadere sub eis.....Et frequenter videmus, eos qui talia docent, contraria facere sermonibus suis.....Castitatem docent: et castitatem non servant, &c. Omnia faciunt propter personas hominum, et glorias vanas, ut videantur ab hominibus. Et plerunque sunt tales, qui diligunt primos accubitus in conviviiis, et salutationes in foro, et vocari ab hominibus Rabbi.....: qui volunt vocari episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi: "Not only they do not that they teach, but also cruelly and without mercy they lay their injunctions upon others, not considering each man's ability. Such be they that forbid men to marry: and from that thing that is lawful to be done, drive and force men to an unreasonable purity. They bind and lay on heavy burthens, and cause men to fall under them. And oftentimes we see them, that teach such things, themselves to do contrary to their own sayings. They teach chastity, and yet keep not chastity, &c. They do all things for the commendation of men and vain-glory, that they may be seen and noted of the people. And commonly they be such, as love the highest places at feasts and banquets, and to be saluted and honoured in the market-places, and of the people to be called Rabbi: that will be called bishops, priests, and deacons."*

At the very first attempt hereof, Dionysius the bishop of Corinth wrote thus unto Pinytus the bishop of Gnosus:

Euseb. lib. 4.
cap. 22. [at.
23. l. 186.]
Μὴ βαρὺ
φορτὶον
ἐπάναγκες
τὸ περὶ ἀγ-
νείας τοῖς
ἀδελφοῖς
ἐπιτιθέναι.

Noli grave illud onus necessariæ castitatis imponere fratribus: "Lay not that heavy burthen of the necessity of chaste life upon the brethren." Meaning thereby, that it was too heavy a burthen for all men to carry.

† Cyprian.
de Singular.
Cleric. [app.
clxvi.]

Neither was it for nothing, that St. Cyprian in his time wrote thus: *Ut quid sibi adhibuit mulierem, qui ducere contempsit uxorem?.....Pejus est quam mæchari [leg. mæchia], continentiam ducere criminosam: "Wherefore took he a woman unto him, that disdained to marry a*

wife? To live a continent life with reproach is worse than advoutery."

It is not for nothing, that Epiphanius writeth : *Repudiant nuptias : at non libidinem.....In honore enim est apud illos, non castitas, sed hypocrisis : quam tamen appellari volunt castitatem* : " They refuse marriage, but not lust or pleasure. For they esteem not chastity, but hypocrisy : and yet the same *hypocrisy* they will have to be called *chastity*." Epiphan. contra Ori- gen. hæres. 63. [l. 520.] Πεφίλοσται γὰρ παρ' αὐτοῖς οὐχ ἡ ἀγνεία, ἀλλὰ ὑποκριτικὴ, ἀγνεία τῷ ὀνόματι καλουμένη.

It is not for nothing, that Chrysostom writeth of the vowed or chaste women in his time : *Nuptias magis dicere beatas licet, &c. Posthac melius esset, ne virgines quidem esse, &c. Perseverat adhuc nomen et appellatio rei : at negotium totum in corpore sublatum est, &c. In deliciis magis vivunt, quam mulieres in fornice, &c. Frequens et quotidianus est concursus obstetricum ad virginum domos, &c. Virginitas ista cum viris plus ab omnibus arguitur, quam stuprum ipsum* : " We may say that marriage is a great deal better (than such virginity). Hereafter it were better there were no virgins at all. The name (of virginity) continueth still : but virginity itself in their body is quite gone. They live more in pleasure than harlots in the stews. There is often and daily running of midwives to virgins' houses. This manner of virginity, of women amongst men, is more reproved of all men, than fornication itself." [lb. 521.] Chrysost. tom. v. Quod regulares feminae cum viris cohabitent. [l. 249.]

It is not for nothing, that Sulpitius Severus saith of St. Hierom : *Hieronymus de familiaritatibus virginum, et monachorum, et [atque etiam] clericorum, quam vera, quam fortia disputavit ! Unde a quibusdam, quos nominare nolo, dicitur non amari* : " How truly, and how stoutly, hath St. Hierom written of the familiarity that these virgins have with monks and priests ! And therefore it is said, that of some men, whom I will not name, he is the less beloved." Sulpitius Severus, dialog. 3. [leg. dial. 1. p. 250.]

Neither is it for nothing, that Salvianus saith of his time, which was about a thousand years ago : *Sub specie religionis, vitiis sæcularibus manciantur* : " Under the colour of religion and holiness, they are made slaves to worldly vices." Salvianus de Providentia, lib. 5. [fol. 31 b.]

And again : *Novum prorsus conversionis genus : licita non faciunt : illicita committunt* : " A very strange kind of

conversion: *that they may do*, they do not: and do *that, they may not do.*"

All these and other like things were written long ago, in the old times, before the fruits of single life were thoroughly known.

Aventinus in
Hildebrando.
[p. 363.]

[p. 346.]

But after that pope Hildebrand by cruelty and tyranny had fully established the matter, and brought it to perfection, Aventinus saith: "Many godly learned men utterly forsook the ministry:" *Et falsi prophetæ, falsi apostoli, falsi sacerdotes emergerunt, qui simulata religione populum deceperunt. Maxima pars, sub honesto nomine castimonie, stupra, incestus, adulteria, passim et impune committunt*: "False prophets, false apostles, and false priests sprang up: which *under a counterfeit religion* deceived the people. The most part of them, under the *honest name of chastity*, commit whoredom, advoutery, incest, and that commonly, and without punishment."

Bernard. in
Concilio Re-
mensi. [xxi.
472.]

St. Bernard saith: *Episcopi et sacerdotes hujus temporis castitatis sanctimoniam, sine qua nemo videbit Deum, tam in corde, quam in corpore, quomodo student observare? Traditi in reprobum sensum, faciunt quæ non conveniunt. Quæ enim in occulto fiunt ab episcopis, turpe est dicere*: "The bishops and priests of this time, how do they endeavour to keep either *in heart, or in body*, the holiness of chastity, without which no man shall see God? They are given over into a reprobate mind, and do those things that are not convenient. For it were shame to utter *what these bishops do in secret*⁸⁷."

Bernardus
de Conver-
sione, ad
Clericos, cap.
29. [af. 20.
ii. 499.]

Again he saith: *Abstinentes a remedio conjugali, postea in omne flagitium effluunt*: "Abstaining from *the remedy of marriage*, afterward they flow over into all kind of wickedness."

In Opere
Tripart. lib.
3. cap. 7.
[Crahb. tom.
ii. p. 1002.]

He that wrote the little book called *Opus Tripartitum*, joined with the council of Lateran, saith thus: *Tanta immunditia luxurie notoria est in multis partibus mundi, non solum in clericis, sed etiam in sacerdotibus: imo, quod horribile est audire, in praelatis majoribus, &c.*: "Such notorious

⁸⁷ [Supra, vol. iv. p. 482, note 35.]

filthiness of lechery there is in many parts of the world, not only in the inferior *clerks*, but also in *priests*: yea and in the *greater prelates too*: which thing is horrible to be heard," &c.

And in the Gloss upon the Constitutions Legatine of England it is written thus: *Clerici hujusmodi concubinas tenent communiter apparatu honesto, nomine appellationis sororiæ*: "Clerks commonly hold and have such concubines in honest haviour, under the name of their sisters." De Concubinis Cleric. removendis. Licet ad profugandum. [fol. xxv.]

Nicolaus de Clavengiis [leg. *Clemangis*], complaining hereof, saith thus: *Capellani et canonici similes episcopis, indocti, ebrii, scortatores*: "The chaplains and canons are like to the bishops, unlearned, drunken, and fornicators." Paralipomena Ursperg. p. 403. [ed. Argent. 1537. ad ann. 1417.]

Robert Holcot saith: *Sacerdotes moderni sunt daemones incubi per luxuriam,..... et sacerdotes Priapi, vel Beelphegor,..... et angeli abyssi*: "The priests of our time by their lechery are like the *spirits called incubi*, the priests of Priapus or Beelphegor, and the angels of the pit of hell." Rob. Holcot in Librum Sapientie, lectione 182. [leg. 183. p. 604.]

Hulderichus, in old times the bishop of Augusta in Germany, wrote sharply hereof against pope Nicolas in this wise: *Decreta tua super clericorum continentia a discretione inveni aliena..... Multos consilii tui assentatores hominibus, non Deo, sub falsa specie continentie placere volentes, graviora vides committere*: "I have found thy decrees, touching the single life of priests, to be void of discretion, Thou seest, that many followers of thy counsel, willing, under a feigned colour of continent life, rather to please man than God, commit heinous acts⁸⁸." In the end he concludeth thus: *Qua nosti discretionis disciplina, Pharisæicam ab ovili Dei extirpa doctrinam*: "By such discipline of discretion as you know best, root this *Pharisaical doctrine* out of God's fold." Huldericus Episcopus Augustan. [ap. Paralip. Ursperg. p. 436.]

But, forasmuch as M. Harding hath no skill in this epistle of Hulderichus, he may understand, that his own pope Pius, otherwise called Æneas Sylvius, maketh evident [p. 438.]

⁸⁸ [Cave states that this epistle of Huldericus to pope Nicolas in defence of marriage of priests was considered so dangerous, that Gre-

gory VII. condemned it in a synod at Rome, A.D. 1079. The epistle is by some falsely attributed to Volusianus of Carthage.]

Wolphgangus Wissemburgius in Prefatione in Antilogiam papæ.

mention of the same. Notwithstanding, I have seen the same epistle written in parchment, in old hand, of good record, under the name of Volusianus Carthaginensis⁸⁹. Further Mantuanus the poet saith:

PETRIQUE DOMUS POLLUTA, FLUENTI

MARCESCIT LUXU : NULLA HIC ARCANA REVELO.

SANCTUS AGER SCURRIS, VENERABILIS ARA CINÆDIS

SERVIT : HONORANDÆ DIVUM GANYMEDIBUS ÆDES.

The matter hereof is such as is not worthy to be Englished.

But what pleasure can it be, to stand so long in so unsavoury a place? They themselves say thus: *Fornicatio simplex non est digna depositione*: "Simple fornication" (in a priest) "is no just cause of deprivation." The cause thereof in another Gloss is alleged thus: *Quia pauci sine illo vitio inveniuntur*: "Because there be few priests found without that fault."

To be short, Polydorus Vergilius saith: *Nullius delicti crimen majus ordini dedecus, plus mali religioni, plus doloris bonis attulit*: "No kind of crime ever brought either more shame to the order of priesthood, or more hinderance to religion, or more griefs to the godly, than the life of single priests⁹⁰."

These, these, M. Harding, *were the causes* that moved pope Pius commonly to say, as it is before alleged: "As marriage upon good and great considerations was taken from priests, so now upon better and greater considerations it were to be restored to them again." And therefore he saith in his discourse of the council of Basil: *Fortasse non esset pejus sacerdotes complures uxorari. Quoniam multi salarentur in sacerdotio conjugato, qui nunc in sterili presbyterio damnantur*: "Perhaps it were not worst, that many priests were married. For many might be saved in married

[Bapt. Mant.
Sylvar. lib.
1.]

2. quest. 7.
Lator: in
Glossa.

Dist. 81.
Maximianus:
in Glossa.

Polyd. Vergil.
de Invento-
rib. Rer. lib.
5. cap. 4.

Æneas Sylvius
de Concil.
Basil. lib. 2.
[p. 59 c.]

⁸⁹ [The MS. here referred to is very probably the one alluded to by Cave, tom. i. 555, as having been in the possession of archbishop Parker, and by him given to Fox the martyrologist. See

Acts and Monuments, t. ii. 456.]

⁹⁰ [Polyd. Vergil. "... ut non aliud crimen quamvis longe de-
"testabilis majora inusserit sacerdotibus stigmata." Jewel probably quoted it from memory.]

priesthood, which now in barren priesthood are condemned."

If the former of these two sayings be so doubtful, yet this latter is plain, and clear, and void of doubt. In like sense and sort he writeth, upon good advice and deliberation, to his friend: *Quoniam huc ventum est, ut legi carnis resistere nequeas, melius est nubere, quam uri*: "Forasmuch as the matter is grown so far, that ye cannot withstand the law of the flesh, *better is to marry, than to burn.*"

Æneas Sylvius, epist. 321. ad Johan. Fontem. [leg. Frunt.]

So saith Panormitane: *Credo pro bono, et salute animarum, quod esset salubre statutum, ut...non valentes continere, possint contrahere. Quia, experientia docente, contrarius prorsus effectus sequitur ex illa lege continentie: cum hodie (non) vivant spiritualiter, nec sint mundi: sed maculentur illicito coitu, cum ipsorum gravissimo peccato: ubi cum propria uxore esset castitas. Unde deberet ecclesia facere sicut bonus medicus: ut si medicina, experientia docente, potius officiat, quam prosit, eam tollat. Et utinam idem esset in omnibus constitutionibus positivis*: "I believe it were a good law, and for the wealth and safety of souls, that such as cannot live chaste may contract matrimony. For we learn by experience, that of the law of continent or single life, the contrary effect hath followed. Forasmuch as nowadays they live not spiritually, nor be clean and chaste: but with their great sin are defiled with unlawful copulation: *whereas with their own wives they should live chastely.* Therefore the church ought to do, as the skilful physician useth to do: who, if he see by experience that his medicine hurteth rather than doeth good, taketh it clean away. And would God the same way were taken with all positive constitutions."

Extra. de Clericis conjugatis. Cum olim. [tom. iii. fol. 16.]

So saith Durandus: *Utile esset, ut in concilio matrimonium sacerdotibus remittatur. Frustra enim hactenus coacti sunt ad castitatem*: "It were good, that in a council priests' marriage were set at liberty. For hitherto it hath been in vain to force them to chastity."

Durandus de Modo Celebrandi Concilium, tit. 46.

So saith Martinus Peresius: *Multis piis visum est, ut leges de cœlibatu tollerentur propter scandala*: "Many godly men have thought it good, that the laws of single life should be abolished, for avoiding the offence of the people⁹¹."

Martinus Peresius. [part. 3. p. 300.]

⁹¹ [This is the substance of Peresius' observation.]

M. Harding will say: *The pope hath vowed, and must keep his vow.* But pope Pius, as it is said before, gave counsel of marriage unto a priest, that had made a vow, his vow and priesthood notwithstanding.

It appeareth right well, both by that hath been already alleged, and also by the common experience and practice of the world, that a vow importeth not always a chaste life.

Optatus contra Parmenianum, Donatist. lib. 6. [p. 95.]

Optatus Milevitanus saith: *In mitella signum est voluntatis: non castitatis auxilium*: “In the apparel there is a token of the will: not a help towards chastity.” St. Hierom saith: *Quid prodest corporis pudicitia, animo constuprato?* “When the mind or heart is deflowered, what avail-eth the chastity of the body?”

Hieron. in Jeremi. lib. 2. cap. 7. [iii. 565.]

St. Ambrose saith: *Non imperari potest virginitas, sed optari. Nam quæ supra nos sunt, in voto magis sunt, quam in magisterio*: “We may wish for virginity, but command it we cannot. For the things that be above us, and out of our power, are rather of desire than of commandment.”

Ambros. de Virginit. lib. 1. [li. 152.]

Epiphan. lib. 2. Hæres. 61. [l. 512.]

Hereof Epiphanius maketh this conclusion: *Ut ne confundantur apud homines, occulte scortantur: et sub solitudinis, aut continentie specie libidinem exercent.....Melius est itaque lapsum a cursu, palam sibi uxorem accipere secundum leges*: “Lest they should be shamed before men, they keep harlots privily: and under the colour of solitary or continent life, they practice their filthy pleasure. Better is it therefore for a man being fallen from his course, and breaking his vow, openly to take unto himself a wife, according to the law.” So saith St. Hierom, as I have before alleged: *Hujusmodi virginibus aperte dicendum est, ut aut nubant, si se non possunt continere: aut contineant, si nolunt nubere*: “To such virgins we must say plainly, that either they marry, if they cannot contain: or else that they contain, if they will not marry.”

Hieronym. ad Demetriadem. [iv. pt. 2. 796.]

Bernardus ad sororem, de modo bene vivendi, serm. 62. [tom. v. 897.]

So saith St. Bernard unto his sister: *Quod incaute rovisisti, ne impleas: impia est promissio quæ scelere adimpletur*: “That thou hast unadvisedly vowed, see thou keep it not. It is a wicked promise that is performed with wickedness⁹¹.”

4. Sent. dist. 36. quæst. 1.

To be short, Johannes Scotus saith: *Si votum continentie*

⁹¹ [The Ben. edd. consider this work to have been written by some other author.]

est annexum ordini sacro solum ex præcepto ecclesiæ, sequitur, quod non simpliciter illegitimat ad contrahendum: "If the vow or promise of chastity be annexed unto holy orders only by force of the constitution or commandment of the church, then doth it not of necessity and fine force unable a man to contract matrimony."

Howbeit, hereof we have said already so much as to a reasonable man may seem sufficient.

Thus far concerning marriage of ministers.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. Divis. 1.

We receive and embrace all the canonical scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, giving thanks to our God, who hath raised up unto us that light which we might ever have before our eyes: lest either by the subtlety of man, or by the snares of the devil, we should be carried away to errors and lies. Also we profess that these be the heavenly voices, whereby God hath opened unto us his will: and that only in them man's heart can have settled rest: that in them be abundantly and fully comprehended all things, whatsoever be needful for our health, as Origen, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Cyrillus have taught: "That they be the very might and strength of God to attain to salvation: 'that they be the foundations of the prophets and apostles,' " whereupon is built the church of God: that they be the very sure and infallible rule, whereby may be tried, whether the church do swerve or err, and whereunto all ecclesiastical doctrine ought to be called to account: and that against these scriptures, neither law, nor ordinance, nor any custom ought to be heard: no, though Paul himself, or an angel from heaven, should come and teach the contrary.

Rom. i. 16.

[Gal. i. 8.]

M. HARDING.

a Untruth. But why do ye not here plainly declare which be the books of the scriptures, that ye allow, and which be they, ^a that ye reject? In general ye say that ye embrace all the canonical scriptures. Yet if a man press you with the place of the Maccabees, for prayer to be made for the dead, and with the words of St. James' ^{2 Mach. xlii. 44.} epistle against your justification of faith only, and likewise with certain other places of the scriptures, which be accounted in the canon of the church, against certain other your false doctrines :

b Untruth. in this case ^b your wont is to deny those scriptures to be canonical. For we deny no more than St. Augustine, St. Hieron, and other holy fathers have denied. Yet here ye bear the world in hand ye allow all. Would God there were in you either more truth, or less craft. Well, ye give thanks to God for the scriptures, for that having them before your eyes ye are stayed in truth, assured that "by subtlety of man, or snares of the devil, ye be not carried away into errors and lies." And is it so indeed? I pray you, sirs, of what sect be ye? or of which sect is each one of you? For I dare boldly say, and so the world seeth, that ye agree not all in one. If ye say ye be Lutherans, then must I further demand of you, of which sort of Lutherans? For that puddle runneth out by many sinks. Be ye Zuinglians, Arians, Osiandrines, Libertines, Adiaphorists, Anabaptists, Calvinists, or Satanists⁹²?.....What privilege have ye before your fellows? A match being made between you (I mean that new clergy of England) and the other sects of our time, &c. If ye have this light of the scriptures before your eyes, how is it, that ye agree not within yourselves? yea, how is it, that each one of you oftentimes disagreeeth with himself? how is it, that ^c so many times ye have changed your communion book, the order of your service, your doctrine of the blessed sacrament, your homilies, &c. Who knoweth not how in the matter of the sacrament your chief captains have shewed themselves inconstant, and mutable, and contrary to themselves, I mean Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and that great rabbin Peter Martyr himself? As for the rest, they be not worthy to be named.

c Childish and fond untruth: for the Communion book was never but once changed. But see the often changes of the mass.

d St. Cyprrian saith: *Non jungitur ecclesia, qui ab evangelio separatur*: De Lapsis, serm. 5.

But what say ye? be these "the heavenly voices, whereby God hath opened unto us his will?" Then how dare ye to transgress his will declared in these voices, where ye read expressly, that he ^d which heareth not the church is to be taken for no better than a heathen and a publican?.....As ye proceed, ye say, that only in the scriptures man's heart can have settled rest, and that in them be abundantly and fully comprehended all things, whatsoever be needful for our salvation, as Origen, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Cyrillus have taught. Either you know not what

⁹² [Harding proceeds: "All the scriptures they have been kept these and other sects of heretics, from errors and lies, and that by that either be now, or have been in them they prove their doctrines," times past, say as ye say, that by &c.]

you say, sir defender, nor the things of which you make affirmation, as St. Paul said of such as ye are, writing to Timothy, or you are foully overseen. If the heart of man have settled rest in the scriptures only, as you say, then in nothing else but in the scriptures. By this you seem to trouble and disquiet many hearts. For if this be true, ^e then had good Abel no better rest in his heart than wicked restless Cain⁹³.....

When the holy book of scriptures was lost, which God restored by Esdras, were there none in all that time, whose hearts had settled rest? what foolish and absurd doctrine is this? ^f what if it had pleased God there had never been letter written of the Old or New Testament? should not God's friends have found his peace that passeth all sense, as St. Paul saith? had Paul, Antony, Hilarion, Pambus, and many other holy men living in wilderness ^g without letters, no rest, ne quiet at their hearts? Nay, who had the like?

And whereas you say, that all things needful for our salvation be abundantly and fully comprehended in the scriptures, this is also as false as sundry other parts of your doctrine. For if all things necessary to salvation be contained in the scriptures, then whatsoever is not in them contained, the same is not necessary: if not necessary, why should we be laden with unnecessary burdens? Then away with all traditions at a clap, be they never so apostolic, never so ancient, never so healthful, never so long time in the church continued. Remember you not, what the most renowned fathers have written of the necessity of traditions? or if you remember them, what thought you when you wrote thus? Let learned and holy Basil be heard instead of many, if not to revoke you from your error, yet to discredit you, and stay others in the truth. His words be these: "Of the doctrines which be preached in the church, certain we have out of the scripture written, certain we have received in secret mystery by tradition of the apostles, ^h which both be of equal force to godliness. Neither concerning these any man gainsayeth, be he of never so small knowledge. For if we go about to reject the customs that be not set forth in writing, as being of little regard, then shall we condemn those things also which we have in the gospel necessary to salvation. Yea rather we shall bring the preaching of the faith but to a bare name⁹⁴.".....For so they were taken for heretics which regarded not the solemn fast of Lent ⁱ received at the apostles, as we read in St. Augustine, *De Hær. ad Quodvultdeum*, cap. 53, and in the council of Gangra in an epistle to the bishops of Armenia. Even so they which denied the ^k distinction of a bishop and a priest, were condemned of heresy, as

^e Untruth.
For Abel
heard the
word of God:
read the an-
swer.

^f A worthy
doubt.

^g Untruth.
For St. Au-
gustine saith:
*Antonius
scripturas
divinas me-
moriter au-
diendo tenuit,*
&c.

^h Yet now
the very same
necessary
traditions be
quite for-
gotten and
abolished,
yea even in
the church
of Rome.

ⁱ Untruth.
Read the an-
swer.

^k Untruth.
For hereby
both St. Paul,
and St. Hie-
rom, and
other good
men are con-
demned of
heresy.

⁹³ [Harding alleges other instances of patriarchs who lived before the scriptures were set forth: but to all he names, Jewel's answer in the margin (*) equally applies.]

⁹⁴ [Harding adds Irenæus, lib. 3. cap. 4. and lib. 4. cap. 43: Tertullian de Corona militis, and St. Paul, 1 Thess. ii.]

1 Tim. i. 7.
Man's heart
hath not
settled rest
in scriptures
only.

Philipp. iv. 7.

Lib. de Spi-
ritu Sancto,
cap. 27. [iii.
54.]

Fast of Lent.

we find in St. Augustine, in the book and chapter aforesaid, and in Epiphanius, lib. 3. cap. 75. In the council of Constance the same is to be found.

l Untruth.
For we say
not, *All*
things are
there ex-
pressed.

Again, if all things necessary to salvation be ^lexpressed in the scriptures, to what purpose said St. Paul, concerning order and manner to be used at the celebration of the holy sacrament, *Cætera cum venero disponam*? “As for other things, I will take order for them when I come?” What meaneth St. John to say: “Having other things to write to you of, I would not” (write them) “in paper and ink: for I trust to be with you, and speak to you mouth to mouth?” To conclude much that might be objected in few words for brevity’s sake, what say you, sir defender, shall we find all things necessary to salvation in the scripture?

1 Cor. xi. 34.

Epist. ii. 12.

m Stale and
fond ques-
tions.

n Untruth.
For it is not
necessary to
salvation.

o They were
written by
heretics in
derogation of
the truth.

^m How think you of the scripture itself? how know you this to be the scripture? how know ye the gospel of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John to be theirs, whose names they bear? This can you not find in all the scripture, ⁿ and yet is the same necessary to be believed. What scripture have you to admit these, and to refuse the book bearing the name of ^o Peter, the gospel of Thomas, of Bartholomew, of Nicodeme? why admit you not the prophets that Basilides would to be allowed, but only the four great, and the twelve lesser? what authority have you to stay yourself by, concerning these, but only that of the church? For scripture have you none for proof hereof. Then hath not scripture all things in it necessary for a Christian man. Is it not necessary to believe the Son of God to be *homousion*, that is to say, “of the same substance with the Father?” Which if you deny, you restore the old condemned heresy of the Arians. ^p The same can you not find in the scripture. Where in all the Bible find you that God the Father is *ingenitus*? where find you that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son? that the blessed Virgin Mary continued in her virginity? that such as be baptized of heretics ought not to be baptized again? that infants ought to be baptized? that the four books of the gospel were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, by what scripture can you prove it? To end, where find you expressly in all the scriptures three persons to be one God ⁹⁵?.....

Homousion.

p Untruth.
For Epiphanius saith:
*Sensus ejus
nominis
ubique est.*
[ὁ δὲ νοῦς
πανταχοῦ.
1. 859.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, to weigh down the authority of God’s holy word, M. Harding hath brought in a heap of ordinary stale quarrels: “Of the difference between priests and bishops: of Lent: of the communion book: of the homilies: of the order of service: and of the perpetual virginity of our lady.” His whole drift herein is to bear us in hand, that there is very

⁹⁵ [Harding instances further in the words “Person” and “Trinity.”]

little, or none authority in the scriptures: and that the whole credit and certainty of our faith resteth only in the church of Rome. He seemeth to take it in scorn, that the word of God should be called the *light*. Yet notwithstanding the prophet David saith: "Thy word, O Lord, is a lantern to my feet." And again: "The commandment of the Lord is lightsome, giving light unto the eyes." And Theophylact saith: *Verbum Dei est lucerna, qua fur deprehenditur*: "The word of God is the *candle*, whereby the thief (or false teacher) is espied." Psalm. cxix. 105.
Psalm. xix. 8.
Theophylact. in Lucam, cap. 16.

Whereas M. Harding demandeth of us so pleasantly: "What scriptures we allow, and what we reject:" he troubleth himself with an idle and a needless question. For we embrace and reverence every parcel and tittle of the scriptures without exception, not refusing any part thereof, that hath been allowed by the ancient, learned, catholic fathers of the church of God.

Neither do we so scornfully call God's holy word "a nose of wax⁹⁶," "a shipman's hose," or "a dead letter," as sundry of that side have delighted to call it. a Albert. Pighius, lib. 3. cap. 3. Hierar. [fol. 80 B.]

Touching the book of the Maccabees, we say nothing, but that we find written by St. Hierom, St. Augustine, and other holy fathers. St. Hierom saith: *Machabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia: sed eos inter canonicas scripturas non recipit*: "Indeed the church readeth the books of the Maccabees: but she receiveth them not among the canonical allowed scriptures⁹⁷." Johan. Sleidan. lib. 23. [A. D. 1552.]
Hieron. in Proœmio in Proverb. Salomon. [1. 939.]

Addition.

Addition.  M. Harding. "St. Hierom speaketh of such canonical scriptures of the Old Testament, as the very Jews allowed for canonical. Such indeed the books of the Maccabees are not. But St. Augustine's words condemn you. He saith: *Machabæorum libros, non Judæi, sed ecclesia pro canonicis habet*: 'As for the books of the Maccabees, not the Jews, but the church accounteth them

⁹⁶ [The same expression will be found in Pighii Controv. Ratisp. 3. de ecclesia.]

⁹⁷ [Hieron. in Proœm. ad Prov. "Sicut ergo Judith, et Tobi, et "Machabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed inter canonicas

"scripturas non recipit, sic et hæc "duo volumina (Ecclesiasticum et "Sapient Salom.) legat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam."]

M. Harding, fol. 321 b.

for canonical,' &c. Now see, good reader, what a loud lie M. Jewel made, when he said he would deny no more, than St. Augustine, St. Hierom, and other fathers have denied." *The answer.* "Loud lies," M. Harding? Your words are too smart. Much better were it for you to be sober. I say now again, as I said before: "The books of the Maccabees are not reckoned among the canonical scriptures." And therein we deny no more than by St. Augustine, St. Hierom, and other holy catholic fathers hath been denied. For trial whereof, I pray you, consider what St. Augustine saith. These be his words: *In Machabæorum libris etsi aliquid mirabilium numero inserendum conveniens fuisse ordini inveniatur, de hoc tamen nulla cura fatigabimur: quia tantum agere proposuimus, ut de divini canonis mirabilibus exiguum expositionem tangeremus:* "Although there may something be found in the books of the Maccabees, meet for this order of writing, and worthy to be joined with the number of miracles, yet hereof we will have no care, for that we have intended only to touch a short rehearsal of the miracles contained in the books of the holy canon⁹⁷." Mark well, M. Harding: here St. Augustine telleth you: "That the books of the Maccabees are no part of the canonical scriptures, and that therefore he will make none account of the miracles therein contained." St. Hierom saith, as it is alleged before: "The church readeth the story of Judith, the book of Toby, and the books of the Maccabees: but the same church receiveth not these books as the canonical scriptures." Mark once again, M. Harding: St. Hierom telleth you, even as St. Augustine told you before: "That the books of the Maccabees are not canonical." And he speaketh not of the Jews' canon, as you imagine, but of the canon of the church. Forget not his words: *Ecclesia eos libros inter canonicas scripturas non recipit.*

Augustin. de
Mirabilib.
Sacre Scrip-
ture, lib. 2.
cap. 34. [iii.
app. 26.]

Hieron. in
Præfatione in
Salomonem.
[i. 939.]

Cyprian. [l.
Iustinus
Torani.] in
Expositione
Symboli.
[app. ccxiv.]

Likewise St. Cyprian saith: *Alii libri sunt qui non canonici, sed ecclesiastici appellantur, &c. Hujus [leg. ejusdem] ordinis est libellus Tobie, et Judith, et Machabæorum libri:* "Other books there be that are not called canonical, but

⁹⁷ [The author of this work was not the bishop of Hippo, but probably Augustinus Cambrensis, fl. 658.]

only ecclesiastical, for that they be allowed to be read in churches. Of this sort are the books of Toby, of Judith, and of the Maccabees⁹⁸." Behold, M. Harding : these holy fathers agree all together, in that they say : " The books of the Maccabees are no part of the canonical scriptures." Much more might be said. But by these few the reader may learn, where to find the " loud lie."

Howbeit, by your report St. Augustine saith : *The church accounteth the books of the Maccabees as canonical scriptures*. What answer may here be made ? shall we set St. Augustine against St. Augustine ? One St. Augustine saith : " The book of the Maccabees is not canonical⁹⁹." Another St. Augustine saith : " The book of the Maccabees is canonical." " Is" and " is not" is a plain contradiction. If the one be true, the other is false. Whether of these two St. Augustines may we believe ? Why do you thus trifle, M. Harding ? or why do you so guilefully conceal St. Augustine's meaning ? I will seek no further for other sentences. Even in the selfsame place by you alleged, St. Augustine saith : " The book of the Maccabees is not canonical." These be St. Augustine's words, M. Harding : thus he saith : *Hæc supputatio non in scripturis sanctis, quæ appellantur canonicæ, sed in aliis invenitur, in quibus sunt et Maccabæorum libri* : " This reckoning is not found in the holy scriptures that are called canonical, but in certain other books, among which are the books of the Maccabees." Here it is evident, by the judgment of St. Augustine, that the " books of the Maccabees are not canonical." These words, M. Harding, ye would not have dissembled, if ye had meant to deal plainly. Therefore it may like you to consider, how you may better bestow this " loud lie."

Notwithstanding, St. Augustine saith further : *Hos libros ecclesia habet pro canonicis* : " These books the church alloweth as canonical." This is true : I deny it not. But here you seek to beguile your reader by the misunder-

⁹⁸ [This work, erroneously ascribed to St. Cyprian, was written by Ruffinus Aquil. fl. A. D. 400.]

⁹⁹ [See the note in p. 624.]

standing of this word *canonical*. For in the former place *canonical books* are such as may be alleged in proof of faith. In the second, such books are called *canonical*, as, although they bear no such authority, yet may they be allowed for certain causes, only to be read openly in the church. If you had alleged St. Augustine's words fully and truly as they lay, the whole matter had been evident. For thus saith St. Augustine: *Libros Maccabæorum..... ecclesia habet pro canonicis, propter quorundam martyrum passiones vehementes, atque mirabiles*: "The church accounteth the books of the Maccabees as canonical," (not for the authority and weight of truth, but) "for the great and marvellous passions and persecutions of martyrs therein contained."

Thus, to be alleged in proof of faith, they are not *canonical*: but, to be read unto the people in the church, for example of life, in this sense, saith St. Augustine, *they are canonical*. To like purpose St. Augustine writeth to Gaudentius: *Scriptura, quæ appellatur Maccabæorum, recepta est ab ecclesia non inutiliter, si sobrie legatur, vel audiatur, maxime propter illos Maccabæos, qui pro Dei lege.....tam indigna perpassi sunt*: "That scripture, that so is called, and beareth the name of the Maccabees, is received not unprofitably of the church, so that it be read and heard with sobriety: specially because of those Maccabees, that suffered so cruel torments for the law of God." So saith St. Cyprian: *Hæc omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt: non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam*: "All these writings our fathers have allowed to be read in the church: yet not to be alleged for authority to confirm the doctrine of our faith." Likewise saith St. Hierom touching the same books of the Maccabees: *Hæc volumina legit ecclesia, ad ædificationem plebis: non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam*: "These books the church readeth for the edifying of the people, but not as matter of authority, whereby to prove ecclesiastical doctrine." Now, I beseech you, M. Harding, what *canonical scriptures* are these, that may not be alleged in confirmation

Augustin.
contra Se-
cundam
Epist.
Gaudentii,
lib. 2. cap.
23. [leg. lib.
1. cap. 31.
tom. ix. 655.]

Cyprian.
[Rufin.] in
Expositione
Symboli.
[app. ccxiv.]

Hieronym. in
Præfatione in
Salomonem.
[i. 959.]

of doctrine, or in proof of faith? If ye had discreetly foreseen these things, I think, ye would not so vainly have charged us with "loud lying." ➡

Of prayer for the dead, we shall have place more convenient to speak hereafter.

The place of St. James, touching the justification of faith and works, is answered before. Neither do we discredit any part, either of the authority, or of the doctrine of that whole epistle: notwithstanding Eusebius saith, It was written by some other, and not by St. James. His words be these: *Istius Jacobi, (qui Justus et Oblias vocabatur*⁹⁹*) dicitur esse epistola, quæ prima scribitur inter canonicas. Sciendum autem est, illam epistolam esse spuriam*: "The opinion is, that the epistle, which is reckoned the first among the canonicals, is of this James, which was called *Justus* and *Oblias*. But we must understand, that it is a *bastard epistle*, and not written by St. James¹."

In the first part chap. 10. div. 1. [vol. iv. 299.]

Euseb. lib. 2. cap. 23. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι νοθεύεται. [1. 82.]

Likewise St. Hierom saith: *Epistola Jacobi ab alio quopiam sub ejus nomine edita asseritur*: "It is said, that the epistle of St. James was set forth by some other man under his name²." This therefore is no new phantasy: but the judgment of the ancient learned fathers. Nevertheless we do both receive the same epistle, and also read it in our churches: and allow every clause and sentence that therein is written, even as the word of God.

Hieron. in Catalogo Ecclesiast. Scriptorum. [iv. pt. 2. 101.]

M. Harding saith: "If ye have this light of the scriptures before your eyes, how is it that ye agree no better amongst yourselves?" And here he reckoneth up by rote a many of names of his own making: "Lutherans, Zuinglians, Arians, Osiandrians, Libertines, Adiaphorists, Anabaptists, Calvinists, and Satanists." In which his so pleasant fancy, he may have leave to sport himself while

⁹⁹ [These words are introduced from a passage which occurs four pages before.]

¹ [Eusebius. Ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν... ὅμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας (i. e. this and St. Jude's Epist.) μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείοις δεδομοσιενόμενας ἐκκλησίαις. Eusebius elsewhere (iii. 25.) places

it amongst the ἀντιλεγόμενα.]

² [Hieronym. de Eccl. Script. "Unam tantum scripsit epistolam quæ de septem catholicis est; quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur; licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem."]

he listeth. God be thanked, we agree thoroughly together in the whole substance of the religion of Christ: and altogether with one heart and one spirit do glorify God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Certainly St. Augustine, St. Hierom, St. Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and Theophilus, as it appeareth by their writings, agreed no better together in their time, than we do now. Yet had they, and every of them, the word of God: and the same word of God was a "light unto their feet."

It was not for any great store of better matter, I trow, that M. Harding thus chargeth us with so often changing the Communion Book. For of more, than of one only change, he cannot tell us. And if there had been less than that, there had been no change at all. And yet, for that one change, he himself in the mean season hath changed thrice. But the Holy Communion Book, and the order of the holy ministration standeth, and by God's mercy shall stand still, without any further change.

Howbeit, gentle reader, if thou wilt know the often alterations and changes of the mass, read, I beseech thee, Platina and Polydore Vergil, touching the same: there shalt thou find how, and by whom, and upon what occasion, and in what process of time, all the parts of the mass were pieced and set together: and that, in the space of seven hundred whole years, scarcely, and with much ado it was made up at last, and brought to some perfection.

Christ's commandment of "hearing the church," is answered before. St. Augustine saith: *Credimus sanctam ecclesiam: (non credimus in sanctam ecclesiam)*³: "We believe that there is a holy church: but we believe not *in* the holy church." For the church is not God, nor is able

Platin. in
Sixto 1.
Polydor.
Vergil. De
Inventorib.
Rer. lib. 5.
cap. 10.

Augustin. de
Fide et Symb.
[vi. 161.]

³ [The words between brackets are not found in the passage De Fide et Symbolo. referred to in the margin. Jewel probably found them either in the spurious Serm. de Symbolo, (tom. vi. app. 282,) where the reason is added, "quia ecclesia non Deus, sed domus Dei est:" or else in serm. 242, (also considered spurious by the Ben.

edd.) tom. v. app. p. 398. With respect to the passage quoted in the text from De Fide et Symbolo, t. vi. 161, it should be stated, that the Bened. Edd. name three MSS. which read "credimus *in* sanctam ecclesiam." The distinction is not universally attended to by the fathers. See Pearson on the Creed, Oxford ed. 1833, vol. ii. 454.]

of herself to make or alter any one article of the faith. The prophet Esay saith: *Ad legem potius, et ad testimonium.* *Si non responderint secundum verbum hoc, non erit illis lux matutina:* "To the law rather, and to the testimony of God. If they answer not according to this word, they shall have no morning light." Isa. viii. 20.
[Vulg.]

M. Harding saith further: "If quietness of conscience come of the word of God only, then had Abel no more quietness of conscience than wicked restless Cain. Then should Paul the Eremite, and Antony, and Hilarion, and Pambus, and other holy men, living in wilderness without letters, have had no rest, ne quiet at their hearts." And why so? Because they had no word written.

Who would think, that M. Harding, bearing such a countenance of *divinity*, would thus go about to deceive himself with a point of *sophistry*? Chrysostom saith: *Deus Conditor humani generis ab initio per seipsum hominibus loquebatur:* "God, the Creator of mankind, from the beginning spake unto men by himself, in his own person." Chrysost. in
Gen. hom. 2.
[iv. 8.]

And St. Paul saith: *Deus olim multifariam, multisque modis patribus loquutus est:* "In old times God spake many ways, and in sundry sorts unto the fathers." And doth M. Harding think, when God himself, in his own person, and presently spake unto Abel, that Abel heard not then the word of God? We speak not so precisely and nicely of God's word written in paper. For so it is a creature corruptible, and shall consume, and perish, as other corruptible creatures do. "But the word of God," which we speak of, "endureth for ever." Heb. i. 1.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "We also in Christ's church have as well God's word in our hearts, as in our books: whence also, to wit, out of our hearts, we may resolve the doubts which arise upon our books." *The answer.* In your hearts, M. Harding? And is your heart the only oracle of all the world? or must we leave God's holy word, that endureth for ever, and resort to your hearts to learn God's will? The prophet Zachary saith: "They have beaten their hearts as hard as the adamant, lest they should hear the law of God, and the words which the Lord" M. Harding,
fol. 324 b.
Zech. vii. 12.

Rom. i. 21.

of Sabaoth hath sent in his Spirit by the ministry of his prophets." St. Paul saith: *Obscuratum est insipiens cor illorum: dicentes, se esse sapientes, stulti facti sunt*: "Their foolish heart was blinded with darkness: whereas they boasted themselves to be wise men they became fools. They turned the truth of God into lies, and fell down, and worshipped a creature, forsaking the Creator, which is God blessed for ever." God grant, M. Harding, that the day-star may rise up and shine in your hearts, that we may see your light, and walk safely in your ways. 

2 Pet. i. 19.

Hieron. in
Jobum, cap.
37. [v. 761.]

St. Hierom saith: *Quomodo æternæ erunt scripturæ divinæ, si mundus certo fine.....est terminandus?.....Verum est quidem, quod librorum pelliculæ cum ipsis literis abolendæ sunt. Sed, quia subjungit Dominus, Verba vero mea non præteribunt, proculdubio, quod illis apicibus pollicetur, erit æternum*: "How shall the holy scriptures be everlasting, seeing the world shall have an end? True it is, *that the parchment or leaves of the books*, with the letters and all, shall be abolished. But forasmuch as our Lord addeth, 'My words shall never pass,' doubtless" (though the papers and letters perish, yet) "*the thing, that is promised by the same letters, shall last for ever*⁴." So Chrysostom

Chrysostom.
2 Cor. hom.
13. [x. 564.]

saith: *Paulus prædicationem non scriptam appellat evangelium*: "Preaching not written, Paul calleth the gospel."

That M. Harding addeth of Antonius, and Paulus, and Hilarion, and other eremites, that they lived in wilderness *without letters*, and therefore presumeth, they lived *without the word of God*, it is very unadvisedly spoken, and utterly untrue. For proof whereof, to name only one instead of the rest, St. Augustine saith, that Antonius the Eremite was notably learned, and perfect in the scriptures.

Augustin. de
Doctrina
Christianæ,
lib. 1. In
Prelog. [iii.
3.]

His words be these: *Antonius sine ulla scientia literarum, scripturas divinas et memoriter audiendo tenuisse, et prudenter cogitando intellexisse, prædicatur*: "It is reported, that Antonius, without knowledge of letter, both *learned the holy scriptures, and bare them well in mind by hearing*: and also by wisdom and study understood them." St. Au-

⁴ [This Comment. in Jobum the as does also Cave, attributing it to Bened. Edd. pronounce spurious; Philipp. Presbyter, fl. A. D. 440.]

gustine saith not, as M. Harding saith, that Antonius *lived without the word of God*, but the contrary, that he was *ready and perfect in the word of God*.

And, whereas M. Harding would seem to make such an account of *prayer* and *holiness without knowledge*, St. Augustine saith : *Lectio sine meditatione arida est : meditatio sine lectione erronea est : oratio sine meditatione tepida est* :

Augustin. de
Scalis Para-
disi, cap. 11.
[vi. app. 166.]

“ Reading without meditation or study is dry and barren : *meditation or study without reading is erroneous* : and prayer without cogitation or study is half cold and unfruitful⁵.”

Thus we see by St. Augustine’s judgment, that the force and substance, both of prayer and of meditation, dependeth of reading. And therefore Nicolaus Cusanus saith : “ The soul, that will fly into the wilderness of contemplation, must have two wings, the one of devotion, the other of knowledge or understanding⁶.”

Nicol. Cusan.
Excita. lib. 2.
[Opp. p. 401.]

Howbeit, what comfort and peace of conscience we have by hearing the word of God, St. Paul can tell us somewhat better than M. Harding. Thus he saith : *Quaecunque scripta sunt*, &c. : “ Whatsoever things are written, they are written for our learning, that by patience *and comfort of the scriptures* we may have hope.” Even so saith Christ himself : “ O Father, this is the everlasting life, that they may know thee, the only and very God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”

Rom. xv. 4.

John xvii. 3.

But St. Paul saith : “ Keep the traditions which ye have received, either by epistle or by word.” And St. Basil

reckoneth traditions to be one and equal with the word of God. First, that St. Basil wrote those words rather of zeal

Basil. de Spi-
rit. Sanct.
cap. 27. [iii.
54.]

than of judgment, it may easily appear, by that the self-same *traditions* that he there specially nameth, and so highly commendeth, are for the greatest part already abolished and quite forgotten, yea and that even in the church of Rome. Yet the word of God endureth still, and shall endure for ever. For example, by one of St. Basil’s *necessary traditions*, It is not lawful for any man to *kneel in the church* upon the Sunday : but every man is bound by the

ὁρθοὶ ποιῶ-
μεν τὰς εὐ-
χὰς ἐν τῇ
μὴ τῶν
σαββάτων.
[iii. 56.]

⁵ [The treatise De Scaldis Paradisi is not by St. Augustine.]

⁶ [“ O mulier, quando tibi datae sunt alae duae,” &c.]

same *tradition*, at sermon, at prayer, and at the communion to stand upright. "And this," he saith, "was given unto us in secret charge by the apostles of Christ." This so necessary, and so *apostolic tradition* is now dissolved and broken, and utterly forgotten, not only in Louvain, but also in Rome.

Augustin. ad
Casulanum.
[ii. 75.]

St. Augustine saith: "(By tradition of the apostles,) between Easter and Whit-Sunday it was not lawful for any man to fast⁶." Yet now we fast within the same days so forbidden, and the same kind of fast is thought lawful, the *apostles' tradition* to the contrary notwithstanding.

τὰ τῆς ἐπι-
κλήσεως ῥή-
ματα ἐπὶ τῇ
ἀναδείξει
τοῦ ἁγίου
τῆς εὐχα-
ριστίας.

The rest of St. Basil's *traditions* stand in hallowing of *water*: in blessing of *oil*: in praying towards the *east*: in uttering certain words of *invocation* at the shewing forth of the bread of thanksgiving unto the people. These things I believe M. Harding himself never thought to be equivalent with the word of God.

But if these and otherlike *traditions* be so weighty and so necessary as he seemeth to make them, then let him tell us in good sooth, and without fable, what were these *mystical solemn words of invocation* that, St. Basil saith, were spoken by the priest at the opening or shewing forth of the sacrament? If they be so necessary to be used and continued in the church of God, why hath he, and his whole Roman clergy, quite forgotten them? if he and his clergy have forgotten them, and use them not, and care not for them, how can he say, or may we think, they are so necessary to salvation?

This is the simplicity and plainness of M. Harding's dealing. He telleth us many tales of the *apostles' traditions*, being himself the manifest despiser and breaker of the same *traditions*. Touching the words of St. Paul, I marvel that M. Harding could so easily be deceived. For

⁶ [In the epistle to Casulanus, no mention is made of the tradition of the apostles for this order. All that St. Augustine there says with respect to the fifty days is contained in two passages: "dies illi quinquaginta post Pascha us-

"que ad Pentecostem quibus non jejunatur," (tom. ii. p. 75,) and "... diebus Dominicis omnibus, et quinquaginta post pascha, et per diversa loca diebus sollemnibus martyrum et festis quibusque pranditur" (tom. ii. 76).]

St. Paul himself, even in the same words, and in the self-same line, would have told him, that by the name of *traditions* he meant not *unwritten verities*, and *lifeless ceremonies*, as he supposeth, but the selfsame substance of *religion* and *doctrine*, that he had uttered unto the Thessalonians before, either by epistle or by preaching.

These be his words: "Hold the traditions which ye ^{2 Thess. ii. 15.} have received, either by epistle or by word." He calleth them *traditions*, although they were contained in his epistles, and declared to them by writing. For the apostles' preaching and writing, in ground and substance, were all one. Nicephorus saith: *Paulus, quæ præsens oratione sua* ^{Niceph. lib. 2, cap. 34. [i. 189.]} *dilucide docuerat, eadem absens per compendium in memoriam, scripta epistola, revocare voluit*: "Paul, what things, being present, he had *plainly taught by mouth*, the same things afterward, being absent, he shortly called *to their remembrance*, by writing an epistle⁷." The like he writeth also of St. Matthew: *Matthæus discedens (alio prædicatum)* ^{Niceph. lib. 2, cap. 45. [i. 213.]} *absentiam suam scripto præsentī compensavit*: "St. Matthew departing" (to preach in other places) "*recompensed his absence by present writing.*"

St. Paul unto the Philippians saith thus: *Eadem scribere* ^{Philipp. iii. 1. [Vulg.]} *mihi quidem non pigrum: vobis autem necessarium*: "To write unto you *the selfsame things*, unto me it is not painful: but in your behalf it is necessary." These words St. Hierom expoundeth thus: *Eadem scribere, hoc est, eadem repetere, quæ præsens dixeram*: "To write *the same things*, that is to say, *to make rehearsal of the same things* that I told you by mouth, when I was present⁸."

So saith Theophylact, speaking in the person of St. Luke: *Prius te sine scripto institui: nunc scriptum tibi trado evangelium: atque ita mentem tuam munio, ut ne obliviscatur eorum, quæ prius sine scriptis tradita sunt*: "Before this time I have instructed thee *without writing*. Now I deliver unto thee a *written gospel*. And so I furnish thy mind, that it forget not the things *that were delivered thee before without writing.*"

⁷ [Niceph. lib. 2. 34. . . . ἃ λόγῳ ὑπομνήσκων.]
παρὼν διὰ στόματος κατεφώτιζε,
ταῦτα δι' ἐπιστολῶν συντετηγμένῳ

⁸ [These commentaries are not St. Jerome's.]

Irenæus, lib.
3. cap. 1. [p.
174.]

So saith Irenæus : *Apostoli tunc evangelium præcon-
averunt. Postea vero per Dei voluntatem, illud in scrip-
turis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei
nostræ futurum* : “Then the apostles preached the gospel.
And afterward by God’s will, *they delivered the same to us
in writing*, to be a foundation and a pillar unto our faith.”

Chrysost. In
2 Cor. hom.
18. [x. 564.]

And therefore Chrysostom saith : *Paulus etiam non
scriptam prædicationem vocat evangelium* : “St. Paul calleth
his preaching not written, by the name of the gospel.”

But me thinketh, M. Harding, so stoutly striving for the
bare name of *traditions*, should better have learned St. Hie-
rom’s lesson touching the same. Thus he writeth upon
these words of St. Paul : “Hold the traditions which ye
have learned, either by our epistle, or by our word :”

† Hieron. in
2 Thess. ii.
[v. 1084.]

Quando sua vult teneri non vult extranea superaddi :
“Whereas St. Paul will have *his own things* to be kept,
he will have no *strange things* thereto to be added.”

And that St. Paul, by this word *traditions*, meant not
ceremonies, or certain secret unknown *verities*, but the very
substance of the gospel of Christ, as it is said before : if
M. Harding will not believe us, yet let him believe St. Paul
himself. Thus he writeth : *Tradidi vobis in primis, quod
etiam accepi, quod Christus mortuus est pro peccatis nostris
secundum scripturas* : “First I have delivered to you” (or
given to you by *tradition*) “*the same thing that I received* :”
that is, “*that Christ died for our sins, according to the
scriptures*.” Here, by St. Paul’s words, the death of Christ
is called a *tradition*.

Basiliius de
Spirit. Sanct.
ἐκ τῆς τοῦ
βαπτίσμα-
τος παρα-
δόσεως.
cap. 10.
[tom. iii. 20.]

So saith St. Basil : *Hoc palam impugnat salutaris bap-
tismatis traditionem : baptismus noster, juxta ipsam Domini
traditionem, est in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti* :
per ipsam baptismi traditionem habemus confessionem fidei :
“This thing is plainly against the *tradition of healthful
baptism* : our baptism, according to the *tradition* of our
Lord, is in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of
the Holy Ghost : by the very *tradition of baptism*, we
have the confession of faith⁹.”

Cyprian. ad
Pompelium,
contra Epi-
stolam Ste-
phanii. [p.
138.]

St. Cyprian saith : *Unde est ista traditio ? utrumne de*

⁹ [Jewel has partly paraphrased St. Basil’s words, and partly in-
verted their order.]

Dominica et evangelica autoritate descendens, an de apostolorum mandatis atque Epistolis veniens? &c. Si igitur aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in apostolorum Epistolis, et Actis continetur,.....observetur etiam hæc sancta traditio:

“From whence have we this *tradition*? whether cometh it from the authority of our Lord, and of the gospel: or else from the commandments and epistles of the apostles, &c. Therefore if it be either commanded in the Gospel, or contained in the Epistles, or Acts of the Apostles, let us keep the same *tradition*.” Likewise Eusebius saith: *Poly-*
carpus, cum recepisset ea ab illis, qui ipsi viderant vitam Verbi, nuntiavit eadem, omnia scripturis consona: “Poly-
carpus, when by tradition he had received these things of them, that had seen the life of the Word, uttered and shewed the same, *being all agreeable unto the scriptures.*”

Euseb. lib. 5.
cap. 18. [at.
cap. 20.]
πάντα σύμ-
φωνα ταῖς
ὑγραφαῖς.
[i. 239.]

Of such *tradition*, it is plain, St. Paul speaketh. Now therefore judge thou, gentle reader, how truly and handsomely M. Harding allegeth these words of St. Paul against St. Paul's express words and undoubted meaning, to serve his purpose.

As for *Lenten fast*, the superstition only excepted, we condemn it not, but use it still. But how can M. Harding say, either that *Lent* is so necessary as he maketh it: or else, that it is the *tradition* of the apostles? Verily St. Augustine saith: *Quibus diebus non oporteat jejunare, et quibus oporteat, præcepto Domini, vel apostolorum non invenio definitum:* “Upon what days we ought not to fast, and upon what days we ought to fast, *I find it not appointed or limited by any commandment, either of our Lord, or of the apostles.*”

Augustin.
epist. 86.
[ii. 78.]

So saith Socrates: *Evangelia non imposuerunt jugum servitutis: sed homines ipsi, suis quisque locis, propter remissionem, et memoriam passionis, pascha, et alios dies festos, sicut voluerunt, ex consuetudine quadam celebrarunt. Non enim hoc vel Servator, vel apostoli lege aliqua observandum esse mandaverunt:* “The gospel hath laid upon us no yoke of bondage: but men themselves in the countries where they dwelt, for release of labour, and remembrance of the passion of Christ, of a certain custom, kept the Easter and other holy days, each man as he would. For

Socrates, lib.
5, cap. 22.
[ii. 292.]

neither our Saviour, nor the apostles by any law commanded these things."

Cassiod. lib.
5. [leg. lib.
9.] cap. 38.

Likewise saith Cassiodorus: *Alii pisces solummodo comedunt: alii una cum piscibus utuntur etiam volatilibus.....: alii usque ad nonam jejunantes, sine discretione ciborum reficiuntur.....* Puto, apostolos singulorum hoc reliquisse sententiæ, ut unusquisque operetur, non timore aut necessitate, quod bonum est: "Some men" (in the time of the *Lenten fast*) "eat only fish: others use both fish and fowl too: some others, when they have fasted until three of the clock in the afternoon, afterward they refresh their bodies without difference or choice of meats. I think the apostles left this matter to every man's discretion, that every man may do good without fear, or superstition, or necessity."

Tertull. de
Jejunio, con-
tra Physicos.
[cap. 2. p.
545.]

Tertullian likewise saith: *De cætero indifferenter* [Prior. leg. *differenter*] *jejunandum, ex arbitrio, non ex imperio novæ disciplinæ, pro temporibus, et causis uniuscujusque. Sic et apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum, et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum: "Henceforth we must fast without compulsion, of free will, not by commandment of this new discipline, accordingly as every man shall see time and cause. For so it appeareth the apostles kept it, laying on none other yoke of certain appointed fasts, to be observed in common of all men altogether."*

Augustin.
contra Faust.
lib. 30. cap.
5. [viii. 447.]

Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Per quadragesimam fere omnes abstinent, non solum a carnibus, verum etiam a quibusdam fructibus, quanto magis quisque, vel minus seu voluerit, seu potuerit:* "In the Lent season all men for the most part abstain, not only from flesh, but also from certain fruits, as every man either will, or is able to do, more or less." "All men," he saith, "do abstain for the most part:" but not all indeed.

All these things being true, and certain, and out of question, how can M. Harding thus assure us, that the *Lenten fast* is the undoubted tradition and commandment of the apostles?

Certainly, whereas they so often tell us: "We ought to fast forty days, for that Christ himself did the like, and gave us example so to do," Chrysostom saith: *Christus*

Chrysostom.
in Matt.
hom. 47. [vii.
486.]

non jubet, ut jejunium suum imitemur : “ Christ commanded us not to follow his fasting, or to fast as he fasted⁸.”

And touching the number of the days, Eusebius saith : *Quidam putant jejunare oportere unum tantum diem : alii duos : alii plures : alii quadraginta horas diurnas, nocturnasque* : “ Some think they ought to fast only one day : others two days : others mo : some others forty whole hours, both night and day together.”

But what meant M. Harding here to come in with the difference between *priests* and *bishops* ? thinketh he, that *priests* and *bishops* hold only by *tradition* ? or is it so horrible an heresy, as he maketh it, to say, that by the scriptures of God a *bishop* and a *priest* are all one ? or knoweth he, how far, and unto whom, he reacheth the name of an heretic ?

Verily Chrysostom saith : *Inter episcopum et presbyterum interest ferme nihil* : “ Between a bishop and a priest in a manner there is no difference⁹.” St. Hierom saith, somewhat in rougher sort : *Audio quendam in tantam erupisse vecordiam, ut diaconos presbyteris, id est, episcopis anteferet : cum apostolus perspicue doceat, eosdem esse presbyteros, quos episcopos.....* : “ I hear say, there is one become so peevish, that he setteth deacons before priests, that is to say, before bishops : whereas the apostle plainly teacheth us, that priests and bishops be all one.”

St. Augustine saith : *Quid est episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est, summus sacerdos ?* “ What is a bishop, but the first priest, that is to say, the highest priest¹⁰ ?” So saith St. Ambrose : *Episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est : uterque enim sacerdos est. Sed episcopus primus est* : “ There is but one consecration of priest and bishop : for both of them are priests. But the bishop is the first¹¹.”

⁸ [Chrysost. in Matt. μάθετε γάρ, φησιν, ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ ὅτι πρῶός εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ. καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, ὅτι ἐνήστευσα· καίτοι γε εἶχεν εἰπεῖν τὰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας.]

⁹ [Chrysost. in 1 Tim. οὐ πολὺ

μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων.]

¹⁰ [The Quæst. Nov. et Vet. Test. are not by St. Augustine.]

¹¹ [These commentaries were in Jewel’s time erroneously ascribed to St. Ambrose.]

Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 23. [al. cap. 24. tom. i. 246.]

Chrysost. in 1 Tim. hom. 11. [x. 604.]

Hieron. ad Evagrium. [iv. pt. 2. 802.]

Augustin. in Quæst. Novi et Vet. Test. quæst. 101. [iii. app. 93.]

Ambrosius in 1 Tim. cap. 3. [ii. app. 295.]

All these and other mo holy fathers, together with St. Paul the apostle, for thus saying, by M. Harding's advice, must be holden for heretics.

¹ Cor. xi. 34. But St. Paul saith to the Corinthians: *Cætera, cum venero, disponam*: "For the rest, I will take order when I come." And St. John saith: "I will not write by paper and ink, but I trust to be with you myself, and to speak unto you." Upon these few words, M. Harding is able to build up his *demi-communion*, his *private mass*, and whatsoever he listeth besides.

Augustin. in Johan. tract. 97. [iii. pt. 2. 738.] St. Augustine saith: *Omnes insipientissimi hæretici, qui se Christianos vocari volunt, audacias figmentorum suorum, quas maxime exhorret sensus humanus, hac occasione evangelicæ sententiæ colorare conantur, ubi Dominus ait, Adhuc multa vobis habeo dicere: sed ea non potestis portare modo*: "All the most peevish heretics, that fain would be called Christians, go about to colour the bold vanities of their inventions, which the very sense and reason of man doth most abhor, *with the pretence of this saying in the gospel*, whereas our Lord saith thus: 'I have *many things* to say unto you: but as now *ye are not able to bear them.*'"

Tertull. de Præscription. contra Hæreticos. [cap. 25. p. 210.] Even so saith Tertullian: *Eadem dementia confitentur quidem apostolos nihil ignorasse, nec diversa inter se prædicasse. Sed non omnia volunt illos omnibus revelasse: sed quædam palam, et universis: quædam secreto, et paucis demandasse*: "By a like kind of madness they confess, that the apostles indeed were ignorant of nothing: nor taught any contrary doctrine among themselves. But they say, The apostles revealed not all things to all men: but shewed certain things *openly and to all*: and other certain things *secretly and unto a few.*"

Athan. contra Arian. orat. 2. [at. orat. 1. tom. i. 408.] By such right held sometime the great heretic Arius. For even so said he then, as M. Harding saith now: *Electis Dei secundum fidem, peritis Dei, rectigradis, qui sanctum Dei Spiritum acceperunt, ego ita didici*: "These things have I learned" (not of the scriptures, but) "of the chosen of God, according to faith: of the skilful in godly understanding: of them that walked uprightly, and

had received the Spirit of God:" that is to say, by *tradition*¹².

So Epiphanius saith: The heretics called *Cajani* avouched Epiph. lib. 1. hæres. 38. [1. 277.] all their follies and heresies, not by the scriptures, but by *tradition*, as they said, from St. Paul: and took upon them, to know all those secret words, that St. Paul had heard in the third heaven.

If M. Harding may have leave to handle the same weapons, I doubt not, but he will soon be able to prove, that both his *holy bread*, and his *holy water*, and whatsoever shall please him else, came by *tradition* directly from the apostles of Christ, and from Christ himself.

But St. Paul, when he said: "I will come and take 1 Cor. xi. 34. order," he meant not to devise any other scripture, or new verities, that they had not known before: but only to appoint them, in what place, at what time, in what order, and with what other circumstances the holy ministration, and other like ecclesiastical offices, should be used.

As for these phantasies, that M. Harding and his fellows have imagined, St. Augustine saith: *Ista, cum Christus ipse tacuerit, quis nostrum dicat, ista, vel illa sunt? aut, si dicere audeat, unde probat? Quis enim est tam vanus, aut tam temerarius, qui cum dixerit etiam vera, quibus voluerit, quæ voluerit, sine ullo testimonio divino, affirmat ea esse, quæ tunc Dominus dicere noluit?* Augustin. in Johan. tract. 96. [iii. pt. 2. 734.] "Forasmuch as Christ himself hath not revealed these things, which of us will say, they be these or these? or, if he so say, *how can he prove it?* For who is there, either so vain or so rash, who, notwithstanding he speak the truth to whom he listeth, and what he listeth, will affirm, *without any testimony of the scriptures*¹³, that these be the things *that the Lord then would not open?*"

Such things they be, that, as St. Hieron saith, "are Hieron. in Aggæum, cap. 1. [iii. 1690.] cut off with the sword" (that is to say, with the word) "of God¹⁴."

¹² [Athan. contra Arian. orat. 1. ἔμαθον ἔγωγε. . . .]

κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ, συνετῶν Θεοῦ, παίδων ἁγίων, ὀρθοτόμων, ἁγίων Θεοῦ Πνεύμα λαβόντων, τάδε

¹³ [The context bears out this translation of the word "divino."]

¹⁴ [Hieron. in Agg. "Sed et

M. Harding saith : " These express words, *persona, ingenuus, homousios*, are not found in the scriptures." So said the Arian heretics too, as well as he. But what forceth that? Epiphanius saith : *Nomen substantiæ non ponitur nude, nec in Veteri, nec in Novo Testamento : sensus autem ejus nominis ubique est* : " This very word *substantia* is not plainly expressed, neither in the New, nor in the Old Testament : but the sense and meaning of that word is every where."

Epiphan. lib. 3. Hæres. 73.
ὁ δὲ νοῦς
πανταχοῦ.
[1. 859.]

Athan. tom. 2. Quod decreta Nicenæ synodi commodis, et piis verbis sint exposita. [1. 227.]

So saith Athanasius : *Tametsi hæ voces in scriptura non reperiuntur, tamen habent eam sententiam, quam scripturæ volunt* : " Notwithstanding these words be not found expressed in the scripture, yet have they the same sense and meaning, that the scripture willeth."

Touching the *perpetual virginity of that blessed virgin, the mother of Christ*, which M. Harding saith cannot be

Gennadius in Catal. Illustr. Vironum. [ap. Hieron. ed. Ben. V. 34.]

proved by any scriptures, Gennadius writeth thus : *Helvidii.....pravitatem arguens Hieronymus, libellum documentis scripturarum sufficienter factum adversus eum edidit* : " St. Hierom reproving the wilful lewdness of the heretic Helvidius," (denying the *perpetual virginity of Christ's mother*,) " set forth a book against him, furnished with sufficient testimonies of the scriptures." Gennadius saith, the *perpetual virginity* of our lady is proved sufficiently by the scriptures : M. Harding only to maintain his quarrel, saith : " It cannot be proved by any scriptures : but standeth only by tradition."

M. Harding, fol. 327 b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. " This is a loud lie. Try it out who will. Gennadius saith not so : but only, that St. Hierom's book, which he wrote against Helvidius, affirming that our lady bare children after she had borne Christ, was sufficiently furnished with testimonies of the scriptures." *The answer.* O, M. Harding, why should there be so much folly in one man? Thus standeth the case : Helvidius the heretic said : " That our lady had other children by Joseph her husband beside Christ, and

" alia, quæ absque auctoritate et " riunt atque confingunt, percutit
" testimoniis scripturarum quasi " gladius Dei.]"
" traditione apostolica sponte repe-

so denied her perpetual virginity." Against this heresy St. Hierom wrote a book, and, as Gennadius saith, "furnished the same sufficiently with many testimonies of the scriptures, to prove, that our lady continued still a pure virgin." For what thing else should he prove? and what is this else, but the same that I say, that the *perpetual virginity of our lady, by report of Gennadius, is proved sufficiently by the scriptures?* The words of Gennadius are these: *Libellum testimoniis scripturarum sufficienter factum.* Therefore, M. Harding, for humanity's sake, spare this unmanly upbraiding of "lewd lies," and bestow them rather among your fellows. ➡

St. Hierom himself in so vain a contention, moved by an heretic, thought it sufficient to answer thus: *Mariam nupsisse post partum non credimus, quia non legimus*: "We believe not, that Mary was married again after her child-bearing, *because we read it not.*" Hieron. contra Helvidium. [tom. iv. pt. 2. 141.]

Here M. Harding thinketh to oppress us with the old heretics' ordinary question: "How know you," saith he, "that the scriptures be the scriptures? how know you, that the gospel of Thomas, Bartholomew, and Nicodeme, are no scriptures?" Thus they labour to pull all credit from the word of God, and send us only to their *traditions*. Of God and his word, they would evermore have us to stand in doubt: but of the pope, and his word, they say, in any wise we may not doubt. Hosius, a special proctor of that side, saith: *Quod ecclesia docet, id est expressum verbum Dei*: "Whatsoever the church teacheth," (he meaneth the church of Rome,) "that is the very *express word of God.*" Hosius de Expresso Verbo Dei. [ed. 1562. fol. 252 c.]

A man might well demand the like question of M. Harding: *How know you*, that the sun is the sun? or, that the moon is the moon? or, *how know you*, that the church is the church? or, that the congregation of the wicked is not the church?

Such idle questions the old heretics the Manichees demanded of St. Augustine. But St. Augustine answered them: *Si quærat a nobis, unde nos sciamus, Apostolorum* Augustin. contra Faust. lib. 32. cap. 21. [viii. 462.]

esse istas literas, breviter vobis respondemus : Inde nos scire, unde et vos scitis, illas literas esse Manichæi : “ If you demand of us, *how we know*, that these be the apostles’ writings, we make you this short answer : Even so we know, that our writings are of the apostles, as you know, that your writings are of the heretic Manichee.”

But for further answer, I reckon, M. Harding cannot be ignorant, that the gospels of Thomas, Bartholomew, Nicodemus, and such others, were never written by them whose names they bear : but were wickedly and falsely counterfeited under their names by sundry heretics.

Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 22. [al. cap. 25. l. 119.]

Ambros. in Luc. in Procmio. [leg. in lib. i. tom. 1. 1265.]

St. Ambrose saith : *Erant pseudo-prophetæ, &c. Erat autem populi gratia discernere spiritus : ut cognosceret, quos referri deberet in numerum prophetarum : quos autem quasi bonus nummularius, reprobare* [al. *improbaret*]. *Sic et nunc in Novo Testamento, multi evangelia scribere conati sunt : quæ boni nummularii non probaverunt :* “ There were false prophets, &c. But the *people had a grace given them to discern spirits*, and to judge, whom they should receive into the number of the prophets : and whom, as skilful exchangers, they should refuse. Even so now in the time of the New Testament, *many have taken in hand to write gospels :* but the skilful exchangers and triers of coins have not allowed them.”

Augustin. contra Faust. lib. 22. cap. 80. [al. cap. 79. tom. viii. 409.]

So saith St. Augustine : *Manichæi legunt scripturas apocryphas, nescio a quibus sutoribus fabularum, sub nomine apostolorum scriptas :* “ The Manichees read *secret hidden scriptures*, written, I know not by what *cobblers of fables, under the name of the apostles.*”

Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 11. [al. cap. 12. tom. i. 270.]

So saith Eusebius of the gospel counterfeited under the name of St. Peter : *Nos Petrum, et reliquos apostolos, sicut Christum recipimus. Sed pseudepigrapha rejicimus : veluti gnari eorum sensus, et sententiæ : scientes, quod talia non recipimus tradita ab apostolis :* “ We receive Peter, and the rest of the apostles, as we would receive Christ himself. *But counterfeit writings*” (under their names) “ we refuse utterly, as having understanding of their sense and meaning : knowing well, that we have received no such things delivered by the apostles.”

οὐ παρελάβομεν.

Thus had the church of God the spirit of wisdom, whereby to discern the true scriptures from the false.

Yet may we not gather hereof, that the authority of the church is over and above the scriptures. St. Augustine saith : *In istis temporalibus legibus, quamvis de illis homines* Dist. 4. In istis. *judicent, cum eas instituunt, tam en cum fuerint institutæ, et firmatæ, non licebit judici, de illis judicare, sed secundum eas :* “ In these temporal or worldly laws, although men be judges over them, while they be a making, yet after the same laws be once made and established, it is no longer lawful for the judge to judge of them : only it is lawful, to judge by them.”

Likewise again he saith : *Spirituales, sive qui præsunt,* Augustin. Confess. lib. 13. cap. 23. [1. 236.] *sive qui obtemperant, spiritualiter judicant : non de cognitionibus spiritualibus, quæ lucent in firmamento* (id est, de scripturis) : *non enim oportet de tam sublimi autoritate judicare, &c. Homo enim, licet spiritualis,.....factor tamen legis esse debet, non judex.....De illis dicitur judicare, in quibus potestatem habet corrigendi :* “ Men spiritual, whether they rule or be ruled, judge according to the spirit. But they judge not of the spiritual knowledge that shineth in the firmament” (that is to say, of the scriptures) : “ for it is not lawful for any man to be judge over so high authority. For be the man never so much spiritual, yet must he be a doer, and not a judge of the law. There a man is said to be a judge, where he hath power and authority to correct.”

5515

Jewel, John, Bp.
Works, ed. R.W.Jelf. Vol. 4.

RT
J

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

